

The Reformed Church Review

Volume I

APRIL, 1922

Number 2

I

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE TO PAGANS

HENRY K. MILLER

Not long ago a newspaper reported the alleged discovery of a tribe that is destitute of religion. Without stopping to argue for or against the accuracy of this report, it remains true that the non-Christian peoples in whom candidates for the ministry of our Reformed Church will ever have any practical interest are and always have been, like the ancient men of Athens, "very religious." Before European and American influence made itself felt to any considerable extent in pagan countries, aside from natural scenery, they had little to show tourists beyond temples and other religious subjects.

Foreign missionaries, therefore, upon arriving at their fields of labor soon find that their former ideas concerning the benighted condition of the so-called heathen need considerable revision. This readjustment of attitude sometimes involves considerable spiritual distress, but he who successfully passes through this experience not only finds points of sympathetic contact with the people whom he would lead to Jesus Christ, but has his own ideas of Christianity clarified and corrected. In all honesty one must acknowledge that Christianity and paganism have not a little in common, and it soon becomes evident that essential Christianity and essential paganism must be carefully determined and differentiated. Of course, temperaments differ, so that some

missionaries strive to preserve their own religious inheritance intact and thus have little, if anything, to learn from pagans, condemning practically everything as "false." For other minds contact with pagan religions has a liberalizing effect, so that they become more tolerant of differences that do not really affect the essence of religion, and also more appreciative of God's wonderful providence in having led Western peoples from the real darkness of paganism into the light of Christian truth and life.

We Protestants have become so accustomed to the idea of the equality of believers that we need to be reminded that the great pagan systems of the world have proceeded on a different assumption. In the days when these religions originated, there was no such thing as universal education. The favored few monopolized whatever learning and culture existed, while the masses lived in ignorance, poverty and degradation. Naturally, therefore, religion assumed two forms: one (called esoteric) for the intellectuals; and another (called exoteric), which is prevailingly superstitious, for the ignorant masses. Worshipping idols, going on pilgrimages, doing penance, practicing various ceremonial rites, etc., constitute the religion of the proletariat, "this multitude that knoweth not the law." But the knowing ones, the "wise and prudent," consider themselves above such "rudiments." They lay great store by moral teaching, some special code of honor, and metaphysical speculations.

Now, generally speaking, missionaries deal with the common people more than with the upper classes, so that it is the popular religious ideas that mostly confront them. Of course, in these modern times of great literary activity, philosophical speculations filter down into the lower strata of society, so that even esoteric religion to some extent challenges a foreign missionary's attention. Nevertheless, in general, the evangelization of the upper classes in a pagan society naturally falls to such native preachers and writers

as happen to develop special ability in that direction. My remarks, therefore, will contemplate mostly the religious life of the common people—exoteric religion, in other words.

Though it may not be the best way of subdividing our theme, I shall consider the Gospel Message to Pagans: (1) Concerning the Idea of God; (2) Concerning Morality; and (3) Concerning Vital (or Experimental) Religion. To be sure the Gospel message has a very great bearing upon the reconstruction of the social order and the solution of economic and industrial problems, but these things are really involved in the other aspects of the subject.

I. *The Gospel Message Concerning the Idea of God.*—(1) Pagans being polytheists, we begin, of course, by asserting the *unity* or oneness of God. The Japanese speak of *yao yorozu no kami*, eight hundred myriads or eight millions of gods. Among this great multitude of divinities are heavenly bodies, especially the sun; natural objects, such as mountains, rivers, etc., and natural forces, including the reproductive powers; animals; deceased emperors, certain apotheosized generals, statesmen, scholars, etc.; deceased ancestors. In a general way these gods belong to the native Japanese system called *Shinto* (Way of the Gods). It would probably be fair to include in *Shinto* also Japanese animism, or the worship of good and evil spirits. Buddhism introduced from China and India; numerous other objects of worship called *buddhas* (men either dead or alive who through numerous transmigrations have become enlightened, attained perfection, or, in other words, have entered the state of Nirvana), and *bodhisatvas* (men who need to be re-born only once more before entering Nirvana).

Thus the Japanese have "gods many, and lords many." This is true, of course, also of other pagan peoples. A foreign missionary, therefore, confronted with this elaborate polytheism, first of all asserts, in the language of St. Paul

(I Cor. 8: 6): "There is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him." This at once raises an issue, namely, the necessity of clearly defining the term "god." The meaning of the Japanese word "god" used to be very broad and vague. It may be employed without change of form in either a singular or a plural sense. As already indicated, a divine character has been attributed to a great variety of natural objects and forces and of personalities. Even abstractions and moral qualities have been personified and deified. The largest Buddhist sect in Japan—the *Shin* or True Sect—has for its chief object of worship the buddha Amida, who had no historical existence, but is merely a personification of light! To be sure, Amida is not a *kami* (god), but a buddha (*butsu* or *nyōrai*). However, he is worshipped and prayed to in the same way as any god (*kami*).

Consider also the use of the word for "worship" (*ogamu*). Not only does it have a clearly religious significance, but in the form of its Chinese equivalent *hai*, it is constantly used in ordinary conversation as a mere honorific. For example, one in financial straits worshipfully borrows money from a friend. Women on a shopping expedition worshipfully look at the goods that are on sale. And so on. The introduction of Christianity into a pagan community at once forces thoughtful minds to differentiate the true Deity from beings of other orders, however godlike they may appear, and also to determine what constitutes a real act of worship in contradistinction to mere expressions of respect and loyalty.

This process of differentiation produces some interesting and at times intense situations. For instance, many years ago a Christian professor in a government school in Japan refused to bow to the Emperor's picture at a public function, on the ground that the act in question was idolatrous. The professor lost his position, but the incident raised an issue

that the government tried to settle by declaring that bowing to the Emperor's picture was not an act of worship (*reiha*), but a respectful salutation (*keirei*). However, while officially a distinction was thus made between an act of worship and a formal expression of respect and loyalty, corresponding to the Western custom of saluting the flag, actually in many people's minds the issue has not been settled. At the Eighth World Sunday School Convention, which met in Tokyo in 1920, there were exhibited portraits of the present Emperor and Empress, specially painted in oil to be presented to their originals as souvenirs of the occasion. The audience rose to its feet and bowed to the pictures. Some missionaries could not approve of this act, while others saw nothing amiss in it. Probably the omission of this ceremony would have been misunderstood by the Japanese public.

Governments feel obliged to take adequate measures for their own security. In the past Oriental governments, generally speaking, have been despotic. The impact of Christianity upon a pagan community naturally fosters the democratic spirit. That, in a way, brings a new danger to the stability of an autocratic government. Before the introduction of Western civilization, Oriental governments had to protect themselves almost exclusively against rival chieftains or other leaders. There was practically no danger of a revolution starting from among the people. Now, however, the fear of a popular uprising is a very real one, and governments in non-Christian countries more than ever before feel the importance of mobilizing religious forces to guarantee the security of existing states. Where a modern Constitution has been adopted, religious liberty has been guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land, so that the problem of governmental security becomes a very complicated one. In Japan an effort to solve the difficulty has been made by officially declaring that certain *Shinto* ceremonies are no longer to be considered as religious, but as

acts calculated to foster patriotism and loyalty. The Department of Education, which now controls the Bureau of Religion, has been enjoining Primary School teachers to conduct their pupils to certain *Shinto* shrines, before which all are expected to make obeisance. This is embarrassing to Christians of sensitive consciences, for a mere official fiat after all has little, if any, power to make non-religious what was formerly religious. However, taking all the facts into consideration, one cannot but sympathize with the government in its efforts to secure its own stability by fostering in the very young the spirit of respect for Japan's great historical characters and of loyalty to the traditions they represented. Has Christianity no message to a pagan people facing such a political situation? Does the Father of all mankind as revealed in Jesus Christ contemplate the ultimate overthrow of ancient governments by revolution, or is He on the side of law and order, even when upheld by authorities that know Him not? You will easily recall certain passages of Scripture that answer that question in unequivocal terms, such as: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Matt. 22: 21) and "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God, etc." (Rom. 13: 1-7). In addition, we have the example of Jesus Christ Himself, who steadfastly refused to head a revolution for the independence of his own country, which refusal cost Him His popularity to such an extent that the very people who would gladly have fought under His banner did not lift a hand to save Him from being put to death wrongfully. Yes, faith in God, the only Lord of the whole earth, will tend far more to governmental stability and security than loyalty to past traditions, which in these modern times of free inquiry are rapidly losing their hold on an increasing proportion of the population throughout the world. Of course, it is to be

understood that a government must administer justice impartially. Should it abdicate this function, then nothing could save it.

(2) Next to the *unity* of God, the Gospel message to pagans must emphasize God's spirituality, which, of course, includes his personality. The Lord's words to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well near Sychar, viz., "God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth" (John 4: 24), need frequent repetition to polytheists and idolators. One of the fundamental difficulties with paganism is its gross anthropomorphism. Now, of course, it would be impossible to think of God except in the terms of one's own consciousness, and there are, to be sure, common elements in both God and man. But paganism as a rule conceives of its deities as exaggerated humans, having like passions with ourselves. Its gods and men, in the last analysis, are governed, not by moral and spiritual principles grounded in the rational being of a loving God, but by an inscrutable fate. The gods being like humans, to a certain extent they respond to the same sort of appeals that influence men and women, but, like humans also, they may arbitrarily and without any apparent reason refuse to heed a suppliant's prayer. In such cases, the worshipper need not despair, for there are ways of coercing gods as well as humans to comply with one's wishes. Once in a time of drought a number of farmers prayed for rain. After repeating their petitions for some time without any response, the farmers got angry, pulled the rain-god from his pedestal and threw him into a well. Thereupon rain came, and the farmers then raised their god out of the well and restored him to his pedestal! Repeating certain formulas over and over again is supposed to be efficacious in forcing deities to answer prayers favorably. It was probably this thing that our Lord referred to as "vain repetitions" in the praying of the Gentiles, who "think that they shall be heard for their much speak-

ing" (Matt. 6:7.) Moreover, various forms of magic are resorted to in order to obtain what one wishes. If everything that one can possibly do fails to produce the desired result, then it is, not because the thing prayed for was improper, for ordinarily that is not a consideration with pagans, but because fate was unpropitious, and that is all that can be said. The petitioner was unlucky, not in the wrong morally.

Such ideas, of course, leave little, if any, room for spirituality in religion. Of rites and ceremonies; of fastings, self-denials, and penances; of pilgrimages with carousings on the way; of consultations with fortune-tellers to ascertain lucky times for doing things, lucky locations for buildings, etc., etc., there is a great abundance, but the common run of people do not dream of a God and Father of all, governing the universe according to an intelligent and intelligible plan formed and executed in the interests of true righteousness and the highest welfare of His rational creatures, whom He wills to associate with Himself in the progressive realization of His holy purposes. Right here is where the Gospel of Jesus Christ has a message of tremendous significance to a people held in bondage to the numerous superstitions that make up the sum and substance of their religion. (Even the more intelligent among pagans, when they do take up religion in contradistinction to moral teachings and philosophical speculations, cannot divest themselves of the fatalistic pantheism inherent in practically all pagan mentality, and almost inevitably cultivate some one of the various phases of occultism.)

(3) Again, the Gospel of Jesus Christ reveals the only true God to pagans as a highly ethical Being. This, of course, follows from God's personality and spirituality, as *these terms are understood* by Christians. Explain the fact as best one can, somehow or other paganism in its religious phase does not tend to high moral character. Classical students need not be told of the immoral conduct of the Greek

and Roman gods and goddesses, and matters have been no better in other parts of the pagan world. There is no need of going into details. Now, whatever may justly be said as to the imperfect revelation of God's character in the Old Testament, it cannot be denied that Jehovah came to be regarded as a highly ethical Being. The best thought among the Hebrews conceived of Him as truthful, covenant-keeping, holy, just and good. Quite naturally, though mistakenly, the old Jews thought of Jehovah as their own private God, who cared for the sons of Abraham more than for any other race. Jesus taught us better, so that we know that God is no respecter of persons, nations or races. Moreover, love is the dominant trait in God's character, which moves Him, not only to "give good gifts to them that ask Him," but to make every effort and every sacrifice to save human beings from their sins and to train them up into His sons and daughters. Of all the titles we give to God, the best and dearest is "Father."

Now, all this is new to pagans. The Japanese, for instance, have a proverb in which one's father is enumerated among the five things to be dreaded! Pagans in general regard the divinities they worship as beings to be propitiated. There are, of course, notable exceptions, but as a rule what is known as salvation, by whatever term it may be called, is to be *sought after* by the sinner and can be attained only through a difficult process. To all living under such conditions the Gospel message declares that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses" (II Cor. 5: 19). Thus the ethical character of God, who is indeed holy and just, culminates in His redemptive love, which stopped not at the sacrifice of His only begotten Son, our Lord, for man's salvation. It is true that this idea in some form is not entirely unknown among pagans, as for example, a Buddhist saint, with but one more reincarnation needed before entering Nir-

vana, refused to enter the state of bliss until he had made it possible for others to share his knowledge of the way of salvation. However, the salvation that such high-minded self-renunciation secured for humanity has been found unsatisfying, a prize not worth striving for.

II. *The Gospel Message Concerning Morality.*—There are two aspects to this division of our subject: (1) In pagan society morality is apt to be divorced from religion; and (2) such moral obligations as pagans do acknowledge are apt to be characterized by exaggerated emphasis and narrowness of scope.

1. Morality divorced from religion is a phenomenon that soon impresses itself upon the mind of a Christian sojourning in a pagan community. *Shinto*, the indigenous religion of Japan, is said to lack a moral code. Buddhism, which originated in India and reached Japan *via* China and Korea, does have considerable ethical teaching to offer, but the moral life of the Japanese people is not governed by these precepts, but by the ethics of Confucianism, which originally was not a religion at all. That this separation of morality from religion characterizes all pagan communities, I cannot positively assert from personal knowledge or investigation, but I am inclined to think that it does, at least at a certain stage of development. At any rate, we know that even among the Jews the priestly caste came to be concerned chiefly with matters of ritual, so that their interest in morality was largely formal or else limited to whatever perpetuated their caste or gave stability to the state, of which they were an integral part. Vital morality became the principal concern of the prophetic order. Now the priestly spirit is the same everywhere. Religion, from the priestly standpoint, consists in the performance of certain rites intended to save transgressors from the consequences of their acts, or to turn aside the wrath of some deity, or to secure some benefit, usually material, together with the making of offerings in gratitude for favors received.

Now, whatever may be the true explanation of the divorce of morality from religion in pagan society, the Gospel message always refers all moral obligations back to the holy and loving will of God for their ultimate sanction. Thus the whole of human life in all its phases receives a religious complexion, so that men and women may grow into the full stature of the children of God.

2. As for the undue emphasis placed upon certain duties in pagan morality and the narrowness of their scope, perhaps these points can be elucidated better by concrete examples than in any other way.

As need hardly be said, filial piety is one of the fundamental virtues of pagan morality. It is, of course, an important element in Christianity also. However, normally the duty of obedience to parents, or rather to the father as head of the house, becomes absolute in paganism. Where this teaching has not been modified by extraneous influence, a father has the power of life and death over his children. He may require them to make almost any sacrifice in order that he may be extricated from a difficulty. With the exception of his own heir, he may give away his children for adoption and marriage without regard to their own happiness. Technically, a daughter's consent to marry the man selected to be her husband and master is necessary, but practically the daughter generally acquiesces in her father's wishes. Moreover, in case of financial trouble a father may demand of his daughter that she sell herself temporarily into a life of shame. To such extremes of filial piety the Gospel message offers the necessary corrective by commanding obedience to parents "in the Lord," and by teaching parents that they themselves have duties to their own children.

Loyalty is another virtue highly prized among pagans. In general this means fidelity to friends or the members of one's own group, circle or clan; and fidelity to one's superiors, such as employer, teacher, ruler. In real pagan morality,

friendship means a great deal more than it ordinarily does with us. The story of Damon and Pythias may seem exceptional to us, but it is really typical of pagan friendship. Of course, this virtue is not exclusively pagan. The Jews also esteemed friendship very highly and in their literature we have the beautiful story of David and Jonathan, while Christ Himself on one occasion said: "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15: 13). However, in paganism, this virtue of friendship is apt to become absolute. To help or shield a friend, a pagan would feel justified to lie or steal, though he would not lie to a friend, unless to save him from embarrassment or pain. The same is true of fellow-clansmen. When I first arrived in Japan, a theological student was assigned to teach me the Japanese language. One day my teacher asked me to advance him \$25, because a man from his own clan had turned up and told him that he needed that amount to settle some difficulty about a *jinrikisha*. As far as I know, the newcomer had no real claim on my teacher, but the fact that he was a fellow-clansman left the teacher no alternative. Though he himself was quite poor and his family needed all the money he could earn, yet the claim of the comparative stranger took precedence over every other consideration, and my poor teacher and his family had to suffer. I doubt whether he ever got his money back.

This same spirit of self-sacrifice is shown by pagans in their relations to persons whom they acknowledge as their superiors. If a teacher should come to be in need, his former pupils could not rest until he had been relieved. In Japan the feudal system has been abolished and retainers are technically free from obligations to their former feudatory chieftains, but not morally. They hold themselves ready at any moment to serve their old masters to the extent of their ability, should need require. We cannot help admiring such devotion. However, there is this criticism to be made of

such class-morality, viz., that a man may be quite all right in all matters pertaining to the group or circle to which he belongs, and yet acknowledge no obligations to anybody outside that group or circle. Like the Priest and Levite in Christ's Parable of the Good Samaritan, he would be apt to pass by a wounded man, if he did not belong to his own set or clan. While the feudal system still existed in Japan, a foreign foe might attack one of the feudal lords, but his neighbors probably would not help him, unless they were in some way related to or allied with him. Things are different now. A national spirit has grown up, and the feeling of solidarity is so intense that if a foreigner should strike a single Japanese, almost the whole nation would quiver. It is this solidarity that has made Japan strong, and it is this national unity that China sorely needs.

I trust that these examples of pagan morality have helped to make it clear that the Gospel message offers the necessary correctives by fixing limits and attaching conditions to obligations formerly believed to be absolute, but really relative, and, again, by expanding and universalizing other duties that have been performed within too narrow limits.

III. *The Gospel Message Concerning Vital (Experimental) Religion.*—We come now to the very heart of our subject, and how I wish I could treat it adequately!

An outsider cannot easily form a just estimate of the religious life of a pagan people. Even missionaries are not always in a position to know intimately just what religion really means to the soul-life of polytheists and idolators. To all outward appearances, there is very little of what we Christians understand by personal piety. In Japan again and again we are told by young men that they have no time to "take religion," as the expression goes. The idea is widespread that religion is something to be practiced when one has acquired leisure, that is, after a man has retired from active life and turned over his business and the headship of

his house to his heir. Some people, as soon as they are dressed in the morning, step out upon the verandas of their houses or into the yards and streets to worship the sun by clapping their hands and bowing. This may be all there is to the act of worship, but even though some prayer formula should be repeated in an undertone, the whole transaction consumes but a fraction of a minute. Practically every house, not excepting the brothel, has either a god-shelf (*Shinto*) or a Buddhist shrine, or both, before which acts of worship are performed. Households are enrolled as adherents and supporters of Buddhist temples, which are visited occasionally chiefly by the women-folk. Unless the visit is for some such purpose as hiring a priest to say masses for a deceased relative, the worshipper, after ringing a bell to announce her presence, enters the hall of worship, on the way casting a few coppers or a small paperful of rice into the contribution-box, kneels upon the thick straw mats and worships the image before her, clapping her hands and making low obeisances. Some do not even enter the temples, but worship at the foot of the stairs in front of the entrance. Ordinarily this temple-worship is a go-as-you-please affair. Each person goes whenever it suits him, and without reference to anybody else. At the Buddhist temples there are preaching-services at fixed times, usually twice a month, when, of course, there is something approaching social worship. There is no such thing as the singing of hymns in the temple services. Certain religious ceremonies are performed in the people's homes, such as intoning Scriptures and prayers in honor of some deceased relative on certain anniversaries of his death. But the priests attend to this, the worshippers having very little share in the ceremony. Their turn, however, comes afterwards, when the feast takes place. Though birth and death are invested with religious significance, the marriage ceremony in Japan, until quite recently, was performed, not by priests, but by the go-be-

tweens and consisted essentially of the bride and groom alternately taking three sips from each of three cups of *sake* (rice beer)—a ceremony symbolizing the sharing of life's vicissitudes together. In Tokyo up-to-date Japanese of wealth now imitate western customs by holding weddings at a certain shrine in Hibiya Park, but the great thing is an elaborate feast at some high-class restaurant or hotel.

The social aspect of worship in paganism comes out in festivals. My own observation has been that on these occasions the element of worship is by no means the paramount one. The crowds that attend these festivals appear to be bent on pleasure. Hence, various sorts of business are attracted—fortune-telling, acrobatic and sleight-of-hand performances, the sale of liquid and other refreshments, etc. Usually a certain amount of boisterous drunkenness occurs.

This is by no means a complete description of the religious life of the people of Japan, but it is probably in a rough way a fair account of what religion means to the masses. Is it not evident that there is very little in it all to satisfy the cravings of man's higher nature? No matter what a man may be racially, he can never be content, like the animals, with physical well-being or wealth. "Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment?" (Matt. 6: 25). "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth" (Luke 12: 15). As some one has said, man is incurably religious. St. Augustine put the whole case succinctly when he exclaimed: "Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our soul is restless, until it rests in Thee." This means more than an intellectual appreciation of the unity, spirituality and ethical character of the Divine Being. The pagan is human, and his soul, too, in its poor way, is reaching out after God. Is this not the teaching of the Scriptures? St. Paul told the men of Athens: "He (the God that made the world) made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth,

having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitations; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after Him" (Acts 17: 26, 27). There is much in paganism that is bad, and some things that are very bad. Nevertheless, considered as a whole, it is at bottom a quest after God. It is not worth while to debate the question whether pagans have attained to the knowledge of God, or to what extent. For all practical purposes they have not found Him in a way that gives rest to their souls. The truth is, they must be found of Him in order really to know Him. All the religious paraphernalia of pagans serve rather to obscure, rather than reveal, the object of their quest. Success does not lie that way. Neither prolonged and concentrated meditation, nor asceticism, nor ecstasy, nor trance has brought real soul-rest to the devotee, as is readily admitted by native Christians after their conversion. Whether we can explain it in words or not, the fact remains that through faith in Jesus, the true Christ, many men and women in pagan communities have come unto the Father, with whom, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, they have become united, not in any occult way, but spiritually, the two hearts—God's and the believer's—"beating as one."

From this new fellowship or communion with the Father then spring those heavenly gifts that make one's inner life the only real sort—eternal life, as it is called in the New Testament. There is probably no necessity for anything like a complete enumeration at this time of these rich gifts of the Spirit. Most of them are given in Gal. 5: 22 and 23, but there are some that have a world of meaning to a pagan upon whom now shines the light of God's countenance as reflected in the face of Jesus Christ.

1. First, I would mention *peace*. In Japan this is a word of frequent occurrence—*anshin-ritsume*. Apparently, it is above everything the boon that is sought after. According to the great Buddhist system, peace can be attained only after

a long succession of re-births, involving a perpetual struggle to eradicate certain natural desires, the satisfaction of which is supposed to be the root of the evil and misery in the world. "The crown of righteousness" is not the object of pursuit, but perfection of character, as that is understood by Buddhists, is an essential *preliminary* to entrance into Nirvana, a condition or state of which the chief attribute is peace. Now, is it not evident that the Gospel message by affording real peace of soul to the convert as a present possession, even before perfection of character is attained, must be indeed good news, aye, the very best news?

2. Again, the convert's new life that is hid with Christ in God is characterized by *hope*. St. Paul reminds the Ephesian Christians that while they were still pagans they had no hope and were without God in the world (2: 12). This, of course, must not be understood in an absolute sense, for "hope springs eternal in the human breast," even apart from religious considerations. But when hopes prove to be groundless or unrealizable, they put to shame him that cherishes them, and it is all the same as being without hope, or perhaps even worse. Anyhow, it can be said truthfully of pagans who have become real Christians, that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to His great mercy, begat them again unto a living hope (I Peter 1: 3). To them He has become "the God of Hope" (Rom. 15: 13). The Twelve Apostles, whose hopes had been dashed to the ground by the death of their Master, had them revived, though in a modified form, by His unexpected resurrection from the dead. This wonderful event was not only their chief apologetic for the Gospel that they proclaimed, but it gave them assurance that though a man died, he would live again. To a certain extent the Gospel message ministers to people converted from paganism a living hope in this sense, for paganism has either too little or too much to say about the future life. However, in my humble opinion,

the great hope that the Gospel of Jesus Christ gives converts from paganism comes through their experience of God's providence. In general, the Orient is deterministic in its philosophy of life. The universe, of which puny man is an insignificant part, is governed by inscrutable fate, arbitrary and impersonal. Nobody knows whether there is any great moral end toward which things are moving, and anyhow nothing that a human being can do really matters. It is useless to plan out one's life, for it is quite uncertain whether circumstances will permit the execution of the plan. Bitter experience has demonstrated that misfortune overtakes a great many, and about all one can hope for is that one may be more lucky than others. But now the new child of God learns that his Heavenly Father, who loves him without measure, is in control of the universe, and he has come to know, not only by the testimony of others, but by experience that to them that love God all things work together for good. Thus for converts the whole outlook upon life becomes changed for the better. A new spirit of enterprise and adventure rises within them, and they become anxious to do things, knowing that their "labor is not vain in the Lord" (I Cor. 15: 58). It was my privilege to join the missionary force in Japan not so many years after our Church's work in that country was started. As I look back to those days, now nearly thirty years ago, I recall how it used to try us missionaries to have our helpers stand round and look on while we ourselves did things. There was such a great lack of initiative. In order to get anything done, we had to give rather minute directions, and then performance did not go beyond instructions. There was little disposition to do even what quite evidently needed to be done, unless a request was made or a direction given. It was not laziness or unwillingness that was at the root of the difficulty, but, as I see things now, those good and even kind people had been brought up to act like machines. They were simply in-

infinitesimal parts of the great mechanism of society and the whole universe. Of course, under such conditions, acting on one's own initiative or responsibility would not be expected; it would be discouraged. Nowadays the Japanese Christians, though, of course, they are not by any means entirely emancipated from their ancient traditions along this line, are nevertheless in a general way wonderfully active, energetic and enterprising. Sometimes missionaries are disposed to complain that the native Christians, because of an exaggerated nationalistic spirit, are disposed to ignore missionaries in their desire to do and manage things themselves. Of course, there is in Japan a strong spirit of nationalism, which, being rather vociferous, probably attracts more attention than it deserves. However, according to my own observation, this self-assertive nationalism is not such a constant factor in the life of the Japanese people: it ebbs and flows. But of much more permanent value is the transformation of animated automata, devoid of personal initiative and ambition, into friends of Jesus Christ and free co-workers with God their Father, who invites their coöperation. This accession of a living hope not only glorifies life for converts, but stimulates their activities tremendously. If this analysis is correct, then, with St. Paul, let us exclaim: "Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift!" (II Cor. 9: 15). In view of this miracle of grace, we missionaries gladly yield precedence to our Japanese brethren, wishing them God-speed in their efforts to leaven a pessimistic, cynical society with their own optimistic spirit.

3. A third characteristic of the new life entered upon by a pagan converted to Christianity is *joy*. St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Christians, said this exceedingly wonderful thing: "Not that we have lordship over your faith, but are helpers of your joy" (II Cor. 1: 24). Of course, we do not have in mind the purely psychical product that goes by that name, but something more or less specialized, which

the New Testament differentiates by means of some such term as "rejoicing in the Lord" (Phil. 4: 4). St. Paul in Rom. 14: 16 says: "The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." This attribute of eternal life may even coëxist with suffering, as the same Apostle testifies in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians (i: 6): "Ye became imitators of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Spirit."

There are two opposite traits in the character of pagans—naturalism and stoicism. This seems to be true of such primitive tribes as the aborigines of our own country and also of such highly-developed peoples as the ancient Romans or the more modern Japanese and Chinese. In innumerable ways pagans show themselves to be children of nature. They act upon impulse, and very frequently with little or no restraint. For example, strong men on occasion think nothing of weeping aloud even in public. I shall never forget the scene enacted a good many years ago in a Tokyo church during a meeting of the Synod of the Church of Christ in Japan. In a severe and somewhat angry mood, the Synod had tried and deposed from the ministry the Rev. Naomi Tamura for alleged conduct unbecoming a minister in having published in English a little book entitled "The Japanese Bride," thereby bringing his countrymen into contempt in the eyes of foreigners. Immediately after Mr. Tamura's deposition, an announcement was made that a certain theological student who had accompanied some Japanese colonists to the Thousand Islands (*Chishima*) had been suffocated by charcoal fumes while sleeping. Instantly there was a violent revulsion of feeling, and all over the church men wailed aloud in their grief! It is thus also with the rejoicings of pagans. If they are innocent, they are apt to be boisterous; if not, then there is great carousing. In general we may say that when pagans act upon their natural

impulses, they are prone to let themselves go and run to excess. Hence, arose the necessity for cultivating the virtue of self-control. Among pagans themselves this virtue developed into stoicism, but St. Paul in Gal. 5: 23 includes it under "the fruit of the Spirit."

The Gospel message, then, spiritualizes the naturalistic joy of paganism, so that even social diversions come under Christian influence. The Christians in Japan are much given to holding social gatherings called *shimbokkwaï*. They invariably are opened with a devotional service. Then follow numerous varied amusements, many of which are quite comical and laughable. A Puritan would probably find a few things to criticize, but in comparison with the carousings of unconverted pagans, these Christian *shimbokkwaï* are virtue itself. At one such social gathering held years ago in the parsonage of the Yamagata church, a soldier was present. After the party had come to a close, he expressed his utter amazement at the good time all had enjoyed in a blameless way. He said he had never been at a gathering of the sort where *sake* (rice-beer) was not drunk freely. Why, he exclaimed, men and women played games together as innocently as the angels in heaven! He never had dreamed that such a thing was possible.

There are a good many young men in Japan suffering from what is called *hammon*, that is, mental distress or worry. It is a dangerous state of mind, for, children of nature as these people are, if this worry should exceed bounds and a young man lost control of himself, the result most likely would be suicide. Now, of course, the particular cause of worry must be sought out and removed, if possible, so that the sufferer may speedily be restored to a normal condition. However, this state of mind may not be due to any specific cause, but the sufferer may be infected by a prevalent unwholesome atmosphere of sadness and gloom. In that case, of course, the Gospel of Jesus

Christ offers a genuine and lasting cure in its message and gift of joy in the Holy Spirit.

A cheerful heart is a good medicine;
But a broken spirit drieth up the bones (Prov. 17: 22).

Most of you have heard of or read about the celebrated tea-ceremony (*cha-no-yu*) in Japan. It is said that the Grand Duke Hideyoshi originated this ceremony as a means of toning down the uncouth manners of the generals under him. When a *cha-no-yu* party is held, the guests occupy cushions on the floor and are arranged along the sides of the room. The host puts the right quantity of powdered tea leaves into a bowl, pours hot water upon it and then vigorously beats the whole into a thick mixture by means of a stirrer remotely resembling a shaving brush and made of bamboo. When the right consistency has been obtained, the bowl is then passed round, each guest taking a sip. Everything is done with deliberation and dignity amid profound silence and the most concentrated attention, the guests all sitting rigidly immobile in the attitude prescribed as good form. Now, the cultural aim of this ceremony is to develop the stoic spirit. One of the heroes of Japanese history is held up for great admiration because of the wonderful self-possession he showed on one occasion. While conducting this *cha-no-yu* ceremony, suddenly, a man with drawn sword rushed upon him and threatened to cut him down. But the host, without the slightest exhibition of fear, calmly proceeded with his tea-making as though nothing had happened! This stoicism is not limited to the military caste. All properly brought up pagans are stoical on practically all occasions when it would not be proper to give free reign to their impulses. Perhaps most of you have noticed the placid expressionlessness of countenance in Orientals when not speaking. That characteristic may have been developed partly through religious influence—especially where Bud-

dhim prevails—but it is due even more to their education in stoicism, which discourages self-expression.

Not to pursue this interesting subject further, I desire to point out that normally stoicism eliminates what gives life its real zest and flavor, viz., joy. It involves continual self-repression in mechanical, external ways. No doubt, some Stoic philosophers, like the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius, attained to a state of considerable exaltation of soul, but for the generality of pagans stoicism makes life unnatural, insipid and a succession of poses. No, the ruthless suppression of natural impulses by force of will is not the normal functioning of a human spirit, which must act in freedom. Stoicism has not successfully solved the human problem of regulating natural impulses, of effecting a real adjustment between "the law in our members" and "the law of our minds." The proof of this failure is the lack (relative, of course) of the perennial joy of living. What is needed is a regulation of impulses, desires, appetites, passions that does not hamstring our natures, but permits all our powers to function fully in the realization of the purposes for which God gave them. The regulation must not be dictated by convention or by the will of another whose aim is to use us for his own benefit. It must be freely self-imposed in rational appreciation of the laws of life, which are simply the impress of the will of life's great Author upon our natures, created in the image of His own. When this sort of adjustment between law and nature is effected, there inevitably follows that pervasive consciousness of well-being that we call joy, without which there is no eternal life, that is, real living. Now, it is this very thing, the joy of the Holy Spirit, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ brings to pagans by uniting them through true faith with the Father, thereby harmonizing their ideals, aims, purposes, affections, attitudes with His holy will, which they now understand and appreciate and to which they yield their free assent. From this new

relation naturally and infallibly issues that joy without which human life becomes anæmic and without spice.

4. This discussion would be "like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out," if it did not deal with the very heart of the Gospel message to pagans—nay, to all mankind—that is *love*. There is no eternal life, that is, no ideal human life, without loving and being loved. Have we not all at some time or other known of unhappy persons who felt utterly forsaken, believing that nobody cares anything about them? How pathetic such figures are! Being human like ourselves, pagans also have this longing to be loved, and, of course, this craving meets with a certain degree of satisfaction even outside the pale of Christianity; but, speaking in general terms, paganism is not based upon love as a regulative and all-pervasive principle. There are, to be sure, goddesses of love and mercy, but they are not the chief divinities. Moreover, love and mercy as understood by pagans are not very ennobling, love being prone to run into licentiousness and mercy into moral indifference. In Asakusa Park, Tokyo, there is the large temple of Kwannon, Goddess of Mercy. Japanese themselves will tell you that a burglar starting out on his nefarious errand would think it quite proper to stop at this temple and pray the goddess to give success to his undertaking! But the chief difficulty with paganism is that, in general, the deities are awesome, fearsome beings. This may come from their capriciousness, requiring that they be propitiated in various ways to prevent them from doing men harm. But even when religious thinking comes to ascribe a relative high character to the gods, their demand for righteousness does not make them any more amiable. If any one wishes to know what happens when the demand for righteousness is made the primary consideration, let him visit the museums of Europe and inspect the instruments of torture formerly used in the so-called administration of justice. All that is but the governmental counterpart to

the elaborate priestly apparatus for enforcing ceremonial or religious righteousness. Is it not evident, then, that the Gospel of Jesus Christ, making love paramount, has a message of tremendous significance to pagans? Would that we could enter fully into the consciousness of a man brought up under a system based upon the idea that his gods are in effect hostile to him, and under the domination of a priesthood that exploits his sense of sin! Then should we be able to understand how his soul would react to the message that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3: 16) or that "God commendeth His own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5: 8).

Then, also, the true (or eternal) life demands full scope for the *active* exercise of love. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Matt. 22: 37), is not only the great and the first commandment, ethically speaking, but it is also the chief demand of man's religious nature. This is something more than altruism, which is a matter of ethics. Essential as may be the love of man for his fellows, human life can never be fully glorified and enriched until the soul makes God the object of its deepest affection. To some temperaments this love becomes mysticism, a kind of fascination, culminating under favorable circumstances in a beatific vision. But that is not the sort of appeal the Gospel makes, or ought to make, to pagans. The whole matter resolves itself, as far as I am able to judge, in a new attitude or devotion. After all has been said, the fact remains that paganism is man-worship. Though there be "gods many and lords many," they are not of the first importance. To a pagan it is not the will of the gods that counts most, but man—his purposes, his ideals, his ambitions, his welfare, his destiny, The pagan divinities exist to protect man and the social and

political institutions he has established. Their function is to assist him in carrying out his plans. In paganism the gods are man's servants, and they are apt to be treated as such. If any should show signs of insubordination, then, as I have already said, various expedients are resorted to for compelling compliance with man's wishes. Now, the Gospel message turns all this upside-down. Is it not profoundly significant that when Jesus taught His disciples how to pray, He placed the interests of God and His kingdom first? "Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth"—these are the things to be desired before bodily sustenance or even before the forgiveness of sins, freedom from temptation or deliverance from the Evil One! From the Gospel of Jesus Christ the pagan learns for the first time the value of man in its relation to other values. It is a curious inconsistency of paganism that, while it makes human interests take precedence over the will of the gods, yet does it fail to esteem human life at its true worth. In some systems extreme care is taken not to harm animals and even vermin, while human beings are treated with cruelty. Now, the only corrective that has appeared in the world so far is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which makes God, His holy and loving will, the first consideration, man being His servant, not in the old sense of a bondman, but in the Christian sense of a laborer who understands God's high aims, approves of them, and cheerfully coöperates in their realization. That, as I see it, is the message of the Gospel to pagans, in the matter of active love in its religious relations.

I have tried to set forth the message that the ambassadors of Jesus Christ proclaim to the pagan world. It is admittedly an imperfect sketch, but even so I trust it may confirm anew the conviction that the Gospel we preach is a message worthy of our deepest loyalty and greatest devotion and

sacrifices. We may be well assured that it is nothing to be ashamed of, for "it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Rom. 1: 16). Not only so, but this power is transforming the pagan world, and what a privilege to have a share in releasing this energy where it is most needed!

A word concerning those who bear the standard of the Cross in the home land. We know that in all life there are two principles at work—growth and deterioration. It is so in religious life. Take the case of Judaism. With its exalted theistic monotheism, it was fitted to develop into the universal religion. I wonder whether our Lord at first did not have that program really in mind. He early announced His purpose to be, not to destroy, but to complete. His immediate successors also seem for some time to have had no idea of setting up a new religion. We know that a party within the early Church made desperate efforts to keep the Christian movement within the Jewish pale. Had it not been for the Apostle Paul, humanly speaking, Christianity would have become nothing more than a new sect of Judaism. What made the final break necessary? Well, as I see it, the reason was because Judaism, though monotheistic in form, had become pagan in spirit. The theocracy had come to be of first importance, and its preservation intact had come to be the prime duty. Whenever the requirements of the existing order came into conflict with the recognized law of God, instead of making suitable changes in the religio-political system of Judaism, the authorities explained away God's will by means of comments, interpretations and casuistical distinctions. Thus, as Christ said, they nullified ("made of no effect") the teaching of God through their traditions. Christ attempted to reestablish God's supremacy in Judaism, but the authorities would tolerate no fundamental change in the system, with which their own interests were so intimately bound up. The time for

reform had passed, and nothing remained but to scrap Judaism and make a fresh start.

But it is not to be supposed that the Christian Church is free from the danger of reverting to the former type of religion—paganism. Recently a prominent theologian remarked to me: "We are making a lot of pagans right here in America." Just what he meant, he did not explain. But, anyhow, be assured that if anything whatsoever, be it a particular mode of worship or a particular type of theology, ever comes to be esteemed as the chief thing, so that God's will in effect is relegated to second place, however that may be brought about, then the Christian Church invites the same fate that overtook Judaism. The kingdom of heaven, of course, will not perish, even though the existing Church should be superseded. But evolution is better than revolution. Therefore, it behooves those who proclaim the Gospel message here at home ever to be vigilant that it be not paganized, that is, made in the last analysis subservient to man.

READING, PA.

II

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SUPERNATURAL CONCEPTION OF JESUS CHRIST

A. S. ZERBE

SECOND PART

IV. *How did the Nativity Narratives Get into the New Testament?*—In the preceding article, the authenticity and credibility of the Nativity Narratives in Matthew and Luke were shown to be unassailable on accepted canons of literary and historical criticism. It follows that the passages recording the supernatural conception can be deleted only by the most violent and arbitrary expedients of a naturalistic world-view or philosophy. We now review various attempts to prove that the Matthean and Lucan accounts as they stand are not records of facts, but misconceptions, fictions, or myths incorporated in the text for various reasons. There being an interval of some thirty years between the date of Christ's ascension and the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, the question arises, how the facts (if such they were) came to be recorded. This is a problem for all parties to the controversy.

1. *Communicated by Mary to her Associates.*—It has been alleged that, had the facts been as related in the New Testament, Mary would have proclaimed them at once. Thus a London woman preacher, Miss A. Maude Royden, writes: "If we are to believe that she thought this thing so unimportant that she never mentioned it to any one until she was about to die, we must assume that the matter was really unimportant, or that she was not the wise, noble and

courageous woman we have always believed her to be" (*Reformed Church Messenger*, Sept. 15, 1921). On the contrary, it is in keeping with the proprieties of the situation that the facts were not prematurely made known. E. Griffith-Jones writes: "When we consider the kind of comment which would have been made by social opinion, if the fact had been prematurely divulged, we need not be perplexed at the continued and very natural reticence of Joseph and Mary. Even when, long afterwards, the fact began to be preached, it led to coarse and shameful slander, lasting even into the second century. It was not until after the exaltation of our Lord that the proper atmosphere for the acceptance of the mystery had penetrated even the Christian Church." According to Dr. C. A. Briggs, "it is altogether probable that Mary would have confided the facts as to the birth of Jesus to her intimates, to some of the women mentioned in the Gospels, and especially to St. John, the intimate of Jesus, and to St. James. The resurrection of Jesus, her son, the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost upon her as well as upon the twelve, the conviction of the Apostolic community that her son was the Messiah, must have recalled to her mind the annunciation, the supernatural conception, etc." Such is the view of conservative scholars generally.¹

2. *Mythical or Legendary Origin.*—The hypothesis that

¹ "Why did the compiler think it necessary to safeguard in this manner the fact of the supernatural birth and Mary's innocence? The reason can hardly be any other than that these things were already the ground of anti-Christian polemic on the part of the Jews. Vid., e.g., Celsus. . . . We may be sure that the Christian tradition of the supernatural birth which lies behind the first and third Gospels evoked Jewish slander as soon as it became known to the Jews" (W. C. Allen, *Intern'l Crit. Com. on Matthew*, p. 7). "The source," says Sanday: "was probably through one of the women mentioned in Luke 8: 3; 24: 10. . . . We learn from John 19: 25 (Acts 1: 14) that the mother of Jesus was thrown into contact with this group,—perhaps not for any great length of time, but yet for a time that may well have been sufficiently long for the purpose. And we believe that thus the secret of what had passed came to be disclosed to a sympathetic ear" (Art. "Jesus Christ," *Hast. Diction. Bible*).

the Birth Narratives are of mythical or legendary origin assumes various forms.

(1) *A Myth of Jewish Origin.*—Working out from Strauss's mythical theory of the life of Christ, a number of German writers, as Keim, Beyschlag, Lobstein, Harnack, have conceived that the Virgin Birth Narratives are a myth suggested by certain Old Testament passages, especially Is. 7: 14: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, etc." It is argued that this passage was seized upon by the new faith as an argument for the fiction of the Virgin Birth. Thus Harnack: "The belief that Jesus was born of a virgin sprang from Is. 7: 14." He adds: "It is in point of method not permissible to stray so far [as in the gentile hypotheses] when we have near at hand such a complete explanation." On the other hand, other critics, as Schmiedel, Usener, Soltau, Gunkel, Cheyne, hold that a derivation from Isaiah's prophecy is out of the question and that the idea was imported from pagan quarters.² Harnack's criticism of this view is interesting: "The conjecture of Usener that the idea of birth from a virgin is a heathen myth which was received by the Christians, contradicts the entire earliest development of Christian tradition, which is free from heathen myths, so far as these had not already been received by wide circles of Jews, which in the case of that idea is not demonstrable." If what each of these schools says of the other is true, then each is confuted by the other. Ergo, both are wrong.

The Virgin of Isaiah 7: 14.—The question presents exegetical difficulties in view of Matthew's statement: "Now all this is come to pass that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, Behold the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and

² Soltau writes: "This at any rate is clear: the belief in the Virgin Birth of Jesus could not have originated in Palestine; anyhow, it could never have taken its rise in Jewish circles. . . . The idea that the Holy Spirit begat Jesus can have no other than a Hellenic origin. The Virgin Birth in particular was certainly not first inferred from the words of Isaiah in 7: 14."

they shall call his name Immanuel" (1: 22-23). Can we hold the legitimacy of Matthew's interpretation and yet deny that the prophecy suggested the Virgin Birth? It is a singular fact that the Jews did not regard Is. 7: 14 as Messianic. According to Edersheim, there are 456 Old Testament passages Messianically interpreted by the Jews, but this is not among them. Can the Evangelist's larger discernment be justified? Hebrew lexicographers tell us, no doubt correctly, that the Hebrew *almah* does not mean "virgin," but simply a marriageable woman, there being another word, *bethulah*, expressing virginity in the strict sense. Nevertheless the fact remains that in the passages in which the word occurs it means virgin and is rendered in the Septuagint by *parthenos*. The refrain of the Immanuel prophecy continues in the intervening prophecies of Isaiah until in 9: 6 we have the magnificent prediction: "For unto us a child is born, etc." The vision of the prophet sweeps far beyond contemporaneous events to the time when the child, the Son, the Messianic King, should be born and fulfil the promise to David of an everlasting Kingdom. Under this view, Matthew's appropriation of the prophecy is abundantly justified.

The New Testament writers and early Apologists naturally sought to establish the Messiahship of Jesus by appeal to the *almah* and other Old Testament passages. That Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, Irenæus, Tertullian accepted the doctrine of the supernatural conception, was based, not on a myth, but on an historically attested fact.³

³ In the article "Virgin Birth," *Dic. of Christ and the Gospels*, G. H. Box writes: "It is generally agreed among critical scholars that the narrative of Matthew could not have been suggested by the quotation, Is. 7: 14, but that the quotation was, in accordance with his usual method, added by the narrator as a proof-passage from Scripture in support of the story. . . . If, as Gunkel supposes, Messiah's birth of a virgin had become a fixed element in Jewish Christological belief before the birth of Jesus, which was afterwards transferred in Jewish-Christian legend to our Lord's nativity, how is it that no trace of such a belief has survived in Jewish literature? . . . But so far from its be-

Not a Jewish Myth.—In seeking to prove that the supernatural conception was a myth of Jewish origin, negative critics are not clear or consistent. Lobstein is of the opinion that it was quite natural to pass from the case of children promised of God—*e.g.*, Isaac—to the idea of a virgin birth. But with what reason can one claim, that severely monotheistic Jews or Jewish-Christians could conceive a Jewish maiden, a "virgin" in the strict sense, to become a mother? The whole conception lacks at once a psychological and theological background. According to negative critics, the early disciples, convinced that Jesus was the Son of God and the Messiah and seeking the source of his spiritual power, hit upon the fiction of his supernatural conception. But this tacitly concedes in one breath what is denied in the next.⁴

(2) *A Myth of Pagan Origin.*—On the other hand a group of writers (Usener, Gunkel, Cheyne) find the idea of the virgin birth, not on Jewish, but on heathen soil. In a popular or even familiar belief among the Jews, it may be inferred with practical certainty from Matthew's narrative that the story of the virgin birth was to Jewish readers a stumbling-block, which it required special apologetic efforts to overcome" (p. 807).

⁴ It has often been shown that a considerable length of time is required for myths to spring up and develop. "Criticism of the Gospel has made it certain that Luke wrote this part of the Gospel as truly as he wrote any other part; and that these stories were not original to him, but were in written sources as early as the Gospel of Mark and the Logia of Matthew themselves. There was no time for the growth of myth or legend; the story is carried back to the family of Jesus and their responsibility for it cannot be evaded" (Dr. C. A. Briggs, *The Fundamental Christian Faith*, p. 87). The attempt to fix a date for the rise of the alleged myth is beset with all kinds of difficulties. How could such a myth have arisen within thirty years of Christ's ascension? If there had been such a myth Paul and early Evangelists would not have remained silent, as Lobstein allows; and so he holds that the fiction sprang up between the times of Paul and John. He, however, admits that it is not proved that the myth arose subsequent to the preëxistence doctrine (John 1: 1). But this carries us back to within a generation of Christ's crucifixion—too early a date for the rise of a myth under any view. Lobstein's contention that the alleged virgin birth was "a fruit of popular imagination," "a pastoral epic of Christianity," etc., is absolutely without historical or religious justification.

Usener in his article on the "Nativity" plumply affirms: "Here we unquestionably enter the circle of pagan ideas" (*Ency. Bib.*, col. 3350). "Unquestionably," says Usener; he has the same cocksureness as Lobstein, only on the other side.⁵ Clearly, these conflicting views of critics who start from the same naturalistic premises are an indirect confirmation of the historicity and credibility of the narratives. As Schmiedel says, "Is. 7: 14 would not have been sufficient to account for the origin of such a doctrine unless the doctrine had commended itself on its own merits." Gunkel cites Genesis 6: 1-5 as proof that the idea of a mingling of the sons of God with men was repellant to the Hebrew mind. Hence refuge is sought in pagan sources.

(a) *A Myth of Greek Origin.*—What analogies do these writers profess to find in Greek literature? The Greatness of a Greek hero, it is alleged, was explained by a divine element in his personality; hence the elevation of heroes and kings to divine rank—apotheosis. Again, there were supposed incarnations of gods in animals, as in the Apis-bulls of Egypt; or the more sensual idea of gods begetting children, as in Greek mythology. Or the fables of Hermes and Hercules may have suggested the virgin birth fiction. But none of these cases is really analogous, for the gods of whom these scandals are related are conceived of as gigantic men who beget children in a carnal manner. There is no shadow of proof that such vile stories formed the basis of the New Testament narratives. In fact the attempt to see analogies in Greek or Roman mythology is so vague and visionary that Cheyne and Gunkel have abandoned it.⁶

⁵ To the same effect Schmiedel in the article "Mary" in the same work: "However freely the Old Testament may speak of sons of God in a figurative sense, the loftiness of the O. T. conception of God precludes the supposition of physical Sonship."

⁶ It is well known that some ancient kings, as Philip and Alexander, in their extreme vanity, caused reports to be circulated that they were divine. Soltan, in narrating that priests circulated the report that Alexander was the son of Zeus and that Augustus wished to have it known that Apollo was his real father, conveys the outrageous im-

(b) *Egyptian Stories*.—Some extremists have championed the view that the idea is traceable ultimately to ancient Egypt, which, it is alleged, furnishes an analogy in the procreation of Amenophis III of the eighteenth dynasty. The god Amen-Ra "incarnated himself in the royal person of the husband [Thothmes IV] of the queen and visited her on her couch, in order, it is said, that he might be a father through her." This is in no sense a story of virgin birth, and even if it were, no one has ever attempted to show how this absurd fiction could have reached Palestine in the time of Christ or before.

(c) *A Babylonian Myth*.—Over against the view that the Biblical account was a late borrowing from Greek myths, Gunkel, Cheyne, Farwell urge that the idea is traceable to Babylonian or Arabic sources and in some unknown way reached the Jews and early Christians. Gunkel says: "We see here [in Luke] that a characteristically heathenish representation is taken over upon Jesus in Jewish Christianity." The background of this view, as developed by Cheyne, is that not only the virgin birth, but the descent into Hades, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, came over from Babylonian and Persian parallels. "On the ground of facts supplied by archæology," says Cheyne, "it is plausible to hold that all these arose out of a pre-Christian sketch of the life, death and exaltation of the expected Messiah, itself ultimately derived from a widely current mythic tradition respecting a solar deity" (*Bible Problems*, p. 128).

In answer to this it may be said that one searches the Old Testament in vain for any intimation that Babylonian myths of any sort were accepted by the Hebrews. It has indeed been urged that the later books of the Old Testament are tinged with Babylonian and Greek thought, and that ideas pressing that such tales may have suggested the idea of the virgin birth. Here, again, the wildest conjecture is the basis of the wildest conceivable inferences. There is no attempt to show either how such stuff could reach the early Christian community or wherein an analogy consists.

foreign to the old Hebraism, among them that of the virgin birth, may have been entertained in Judaism, early and late. It is indeed true that the attitude toward the foreigner as exhibited in such passages as I Kings 8: 41-3 is somewhat different from that in Deut. 20: 17 (expulsion of Canaanites). "But," says Professor McFadyen, "the prevalent mood was one of hostility: the heathen lay beyond the covenant. They stood for something which it was the business of a good Jew to destroy. The old temper, which in the far-off days urged the extermination of the Canaanites, was flaming still: it was a case of *Judæa contra mundum*" (*Expository Times*, March, 1921).⁷

No pre-Christian literature, whether Talmudic, rabbinic, or Greek, contains the slightest intimation that New Testament doctrines were derived from or suggested by outside sources. In fact, F. Weber in his classic work (*Juedische Theologie auf Grund Des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*) has a whole section on "*Der esoterische Character der Juedischen Religiositaet*." In another section Weber recounts that all dealings, whether social, commercial, literary or religious with the heathen, are forbidden upon pain of expulsion from the congregation.⁸ Harnack reminds us that

⁷ Numberless passages in the O. T., when we understand their historical implications, can be most luminously described as anti-Canaanite, anti-Assyrian, anti-Babylonian, or anti-Græco-Syrian. This does not mean, of course, that the O. T. learnt nothing from the types of civilization which it attacked. In point of fact, it has a very absorbent genius, and it learned from them all, adapting, assimilating, and transforming. But that is another story. Here we are concerned with the aspect of protest. Some of the most innocent assertions of the O. T. have, for the historical student, a definitely polemical flavour: there is far more 'fight' in them than the ordinary reader imagines. The first chapter of Genesis, for example, is thoroughly anti-Babylonian. The Creation story, like the Flood story, is throughout an implicit criticism of the old heathen tales, and a deliberate elimination or transformation of such moral and religious qualities as were intolerable to the purer and austerer genius of the Hebrew religion" (McFadyen, *Expos. Times*, April, 1921).

⁸ In the section on "The People of God," we read: "Zwischen denen, welche dem Reich Gottes und Gott dienen, und den Heiden, welche

"the oldest Christianity strictly refrained from everything polytheistic and heathen" and declares that "the unreasonable method of collecting from the mythology of all peoples parallels for original Church traditions, whether historical reports or legends, is *valueless*."

What, then, must be the conclusion as to the manner in which the birth narratives found their way into the Matthean and Lucal Gospels? It was shown that the narratives are integral and necessary parts of the warp and woof of the text, that they can be deleted only by the most arbitrary and indefensible expedients, that the facts were at the proper time communicated by Mary to her immediate circle, and that the attempts to show that the whole conception grew out of myths springing up on Jewish or pagan soil, are absolutely without support and mutually destructive. The hypothesis that it was a myth springing up in Jewish circles, championed by Keim, Beyschlag, Lobstein, Harnack, is refuted by Usener, Hillmann, Soltau, Gunkel, Cheyne, whose alternative hypothesis of pagan origin is in turn demolished by the former group of critics.

V. *The Argument from Silence*

We are told that the silence of other New Testament writers disproves the doctrine under consideration. But the argument from silence is precarious and cuts both ways. A fact may be so well known that reference to it is unnecessary. Thus the Apostle Peter nowhere refers to Satan. Are we to suppose that he questioned the existence of the arch enemy? The word *gehenna* occurs eleven times in the first three Gospels, but nowhere else in the New Testament except in James 3:6. Does the silence of Paul, Peter and the rest compel us to infer that there is no such state or dem Dienste und der Lust dieser Welt ergeben sind, kann keine Gemeinschaft bestehen, weder Gemeinschaft des leiblichen, noch des geistlichen Lebens. . . . Der Genuss von Brod, Oel, und Wein der Heiden ist verboten, weil es den Israeliten in irgend welchen Zusammenhang mit dem Goetzendienste bringen koennte" (*op. cit.*, p. 59).

place? If so, it would follow that unless a fact, event or doctrine be mentioned by a number of Biblical writers, it may not be accepted—an absolutely illicit hermeneutical demand.⁹ As seen above, the facts would be known in Mary's immediate circle, including Elizabeth, Anna, possibly Joanna, Simeon, John and probably others and would gradually find their way to other disciples. It is alleged that the silence of Mark, an early writer, is inexplicable if he knew of the great event. But since his narrative begins with the baptism of John, he had no occasion to refer to the nativity of Jesus.¹⁰ As Mark was the son of that Mary in whose house early Christians often met, he would have met the mother of Jesus and possibly have learned the facts. It would be interesting to know what he included under the significant words, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

The fourth Evangelist states the divine descent, but omits an account of the earthly origin of Jesus. *How* "the Word became flesh," he does not state. But so transcendent an event would imply an exceptional birth. It is an ancient tradition, attested by Polycarp and Irenæus, that John detested the view of Cerinthus that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by ordinary generation. As Cerinthus is the earliest known impugner of the virgin birth, there is no escape from the conclusion that John not only knew of the doctrine, but defended it vigorously upon occasion.¹¹

⁹ Silence may imply different things not always readily determined. If an author neglect to state facts bearing on the subject in hand and materially modifying or negating what he says, it may be inferred that he had no knowledge of such facts, or intended to suppress them or wrote before their occurrence. The question here is to what extent the other New Testament writers had knowledge of, and would be expected to refer to, the miraculous birth.

¹⁰ Dr. Swete writes: "Much has been made of the silence of Mark, but the argument *ex silentio* was never more conspicuously misplaced; it is puerile to demand of a record which professes to begin with the ministry of the Baptist, that it shall mention an event which preceded the Baptist's birth" (*Apostles' Creed*, p. 48).

Though Paul does not directly refer to the supernatural conception, his whole theology from first to last is not only in harmony therewith but presupposes something of the kind. "Because Paul does not explicitly repeat the narrative of the supernatural conception it has been argued that he did not know anything about it, and that consequently, it was not a part of the faith of primitive Christianity; or, he did know of it, but did not accept it, and therefore did not teach it. . . . But the argument from silence must not be pressed too far, because (1) his epistles are silent on almost all the facts of Christ's life, as he assumed their knowledge from the constant oral teaching; (2) we have after all very little literature from Paul; (3) the evangelist who stood nearest to Paul, Luke, contains the fullest account of the mode of Christ's incarnation; this method of incarnation was essential (4) because the Savior of mankind was to be the embodiment of God's eternal nature, while the ordinary process of generation is the beginning of a new personality; (5) because only a real incarnation guarantees the sinless perfection of Christ" (Dr. P. Vollmer, *The Life of Christ*, p. 318).

Constructively the doctrine is implied in a few Pauline texts, as in Rom. 1: 3-4, "concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David, according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Whatever be the precise shade of meaning of the word vari-

¹¹ Dr. Orr says: "John had unquestionably the Gospels of Matthew and Luke in his hands; he wrote at a time when the virgin birth was already a general article of belief in the Church. . . . What then is John's relation to the narratives of the birth of Christ in these earlier Gospels? He knew them. Does he repudiate them? Or contradict them? Or correct them? If he does not—and who will be bold enough to affirm that he does?—what remains but to believe that he accepted them? Remember that Mary had been placed under John's guardianship by Jesus Himself, and probably lived in his house till she died" (*The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 109).

ously rendered by "declared," "determined," "installed," it is certain, as says Sanday, "that St. Paul did not hold that the Son of God *became* Son by the Resurrection," but that He was such from all eternity. The antithesis, "according to the flesh" and "the spirit of holiness," is that flesh and spirit are opposed to each other as "human" to "divine," and not as "body" to "spirit," as sometimes held. The passage implies the preëxistence of the Logos and His unique incarnation, and that is the chief point in dispute.

I Cor. 15: 47, "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven." The second member of this comparison refers to the heavenly origin of Christ as the God-Man. Another passage may not be overlooked: "When the fulness of time came, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, etc." (Gal. 4: 4). Burton hold: "*The words, God sent forth his Son, . . .* must, in view of the Apostle's belief in the preëxistence of Jesus, as set forth in I Cor. 8: 16; Phil. 2: 6; Col. 1: 15, and of the parallelism of verse 6, be interpreted as having reference to the sending of the Son from His preëxistent state (in the form of God, Phil. 2: 6) into the world (*Intern. Crit. Com.* p. 217).¹²

We may yet refer to the classical passage, Phil. 2: 6: "Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God, a thing to be grasped, etc.," which has a bearing on the supernatural conception to the extent that it teaches the preëxistence and deity of Christ.

How, then, stands the matter? "The argument from silence," says Briggs, "depends for its use, *first*, upon the question whether the matter came fairly within the scope

¹² The "born of a woman" must be regarded as predicated of the Son as something peculiar. It would be trite and meaningless to assume that Paul has in mind a mere man to whom the character of God's Son belonged. The phrase has a meaning only in the case of One who in His real character was born of a woman in an unusual manner.

of the author's argument; and *second*, upon whether a good reason may be assigned for its omission. We cannot say that these early preachers were bound to preach the doctrine of the virgin birth. They were witnesses of the Resurrection; they testified to what they themselves had seen and known, and the relation of these things to the Old Testament Scriptures, in order to show that Jesus was indeed the Messiah. It was not necessary to mention the virgin birth for that purpose" (*op. cit.* p. 66).

A critical examination of the occasion, plan and purpose of the several New Testament writings will show that the omission of a direct reference does not imply ignorance of, or indifference to, the fact, nor impair the completeness and symmetry of the writings. It means simply, that the authors, knowing the facts as contained in the original logia and cherished in private circles, and officially related once for all by Matthew and Luke, and mindful of Jewish calumny, did not regard a further statement as coming within the scope of their message.¹⁸

¹⁸ The allusions of Paul to the prior existence of the Savior are entirely consistent with the hypothesis that he was as clearly acquainted with the virgin birth as he certainly was with that body of Evangelic narrative which, unquestionably, is ever in the background of his teaching, but to which he makes no distinct and unmistakable reference. Further, his doctrine of the Second Adam, "the Lord from heaven," postulates His humanity as a new creative act of God, parallel with the creation of the First Adam, and marking a spiritual start for the race (E. Griffith-Jones, *The Ascent through Christ*, p. 260).

DAYTON, O.

III

THE FAILURE OF THE DARWINIAN METHOD

A. E. TRUXAL

The history of mankind is largely a history of warfare and bloodshed. In all ages wars succeeded each other generally in rapid succession. The doors of Janus were never closed many years at a time. Nation has been against nation, government against government, ruler against ruler. When a king felt himself dishonored by the ruler of another nation he would assemble his army and navy and go forth to conquer the offender and bring his country into subjection. Or when one ruler or government wished to enlarge his domain he would make war against a weaker nation and conquer it. Large nations and small nations have arrayed themselves against each other in cruel warfare. Long wars and brief wars have been waged; large battles and small battles have been fought. From the beginning there has been a continual going forth killing and to kill. Millions of men have been slain from age to age. As a consequence the human family has been characterized as a race of homicides. And in this multitudinous warfare it was not generally a question of right, but of might. Physical force controlled men. The nation that could raise the largest and best equipped army and supply it with the most effective implements of war was regarded as the most efficient nation; but efficient in its own interests. Selfishness was the motive and might the means by which it would establish and maintain itself.

But about two thousand years ago an institution was established among men that was actuated by a different motive and operated according to different principles, whose of mankind. But they recognized nothing beyond their

founder taught: Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also; Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; put again the sword in its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. And the institution founded upon this Teacher never ceased to proclaim Peace on earth, good will toward men. And yet no sooner had that institution acquired sufficient ecclesiastical and civil power than it began to resort to physical force for the accomplishment of its ends. It banished and imprisoned those whom it had pronounced heretics; it burnt John Huss, Savonarola and a host of others at the stake; it resorted to most inhuman persecutions, and waged most cruel wars in its name. It sought to maintain and enlarge itself by the exercise of physical force. This appeal to force and bloody warfare went forward in church and state until a climax was reached in the war of 1914-18, in which many nations were involved, the largest armies engaged, and millions of soldiers slain. That terrible catastrophe has caused the world to pause and examine into the principles upon which its civilization rests.

It must, however, be noted that within the last hundred years a different spirit began to prevail. The idea of peace and good will to men was laying hold of the hearts of the people. The church undertook the work of Foreign Missions in a real earnest way. Men and women volunteered and were sent in all directions to heathen lands for the salvation and amelioration of their people. Many of these suffered martyrdom in the cause. The people in the countries of Europe and America were brought to see the value of the fraternal spirit by international Christian alliances. The churches of the different nations and of mission fields sent their delegates to general conferences in which they met in brotherly love for the purpose of encouraging and aiding one another in the common cause in which they were all en-

gaged. This had the effect of begetting in the minds and hearts of rulers and people the idea of peace and good will among men of every nation. The operation of the Red Cross that grew out of the teaching of the Gospel, which knew no difference between races and nationalities in its ministrations, nurtured the feeling of kindness between the peoples of the world. Rulers and statesmen came under the influence of these moral forces brought into operation. The Czar of Russia took initiatory steps for the organization of the Hague Tribunal by means of which the way was to be prepared for nations to settle their difficulties without an appeal to the sword. The Universities of Europe and America began to exchange professors for the purpose of bringing about a better understanding and a more friendly feeling between the nations. All this was instrumental in bringing about a better condition in the world. Love and good will had apparently been so well established that many persons comforted themselves with the conviction that large wars between the foremost nations would never again arise. But alas! the condition proved to be only superficial. Back of it and deeper than it another force was at work by which the idea of peace and good will was overwhelmed, and this force originated in the department of science.

In 1859, Charles Robert Darwin published his book on *The Origin of Species* in which he proclaimed the doctrine of the evolution of life in this world by means of natural selection. According to his doctrine in the struggle of life which is continually going on the weak and inefficient perish and the fittest survive, and by individual inheritance their descendants are advanced to higher stages of being. This evolution proceeded from the most primitive form of life up to man, the crown of the species. The time required for this process of evolution was measured by millions of years. The book was widely circulated and well received by scientists in general. Edition followed edition. It was

translated into foreign languages, especially into German. The doctrine gained many adherents from men in the various departments of learning. It caused some Christians to lose their faith. Some persons stood aghast before the boldness of its assumptions; others remained indifferently neutral; and still others condemned it in the strongest terms because of its far-reaching interference with many traditional religious beliefs.

The theory of evolution with the Darwinian factors in its operation to a large extent revolutionized the thinking of the world. It made the widest and deepest impression upon the German mind. The theory had to do mainly with life under its physical aspect. But it soon came to be realized that if it were true in that sphere it would also be true in regard to man considered mentally, morally and socially. In the light of Darwinism the individual was challenged to make himself most efficient for his own interests; and the state as a collective unit was also challenged to make itself most efficient in order that it may survive and maintain itself. Unfit nations may perish and if they stand in the way of efficient nations they must be destroyed. As a result the struggle among the nations was given a new motive and was most vigorously renewed, and the idea of peace and good will was retired to the background. The Germans carried out the principle of individual and national efficiency by means of what they called their *Kultur*, which Dr. Harnack explained in an address to the Americans assembled in Berlin, previous to their departure for the home land after the opening of the war, to consist of three propositions:

First. The Infinite value of the individual soul.

Second. The duty of each person to develop the powers of his soul to the utmost degree possible.

Third. His obligation to dedicate all that he is and possesses to the service of the state.

This teaching would have been admirable if they had gone one step farther and said that the state exists for the benefit

state. Humanity ended at the borders of Germany. The state is not amenable to any law, moral or international, that would interfere with its own will and purpose. The state is a law unto itself. In comparison with all this how beautiful and comforting is the petition closing the prayer for the nation as given in the Order of Worship: Make us strong and great in the fear of God and in the love of righteousness, so that being blessed of Thee we may become a blessing to all nations.

The German Government set the ideals of their Kultur before people in a thoroughly systematic manner. The Emperor by circular letter laid it upon the minds and hearts of the teachers of the elementary and intermediate schools to train the children in them. The same conceptions were taught in the gymnasiums and universities, instilled into the minds of the soldiers, and proclaimed from their pulpits. And with it all the greatness and goodness of the House of Hohenzollern were emphasized. The Germans pursued their ideals relentlessly and actualized them in a marvelous degree. No wonder their nation became unitedly and intensively strong and efficient! No wonder its army became a most efficient machine of destruction! No wonder the German soldiers could commit the most atrocious and to us most horrible acts in the late war without any compunctions of conscience! They were so taught as the following extract from *Kriegsbrauch im Landkriege*, their war book, clearly shows:

"Should they (the peaceful inhabitants of an invaded county) be exposed to the fire of their own troops? Yes: it may be indefensible, but the main justification is that it is successful.

"Should prisoners of war be put to death? It is always ugly but it is sometimes expedient.

"May one hire an assassin, or corrupt a citizen or incite an incendiary? Certainly: it may not be respectable, and honor may fly shy of it, but the law of war is less touchy.

"Should the women and children, the old and feeble, be allowed to depart before bombardment begins? On the contrary: their presence is greatly desired; it makes the bombardment all the more efficient!"¹

The whole matter was made to rest upon power and expediency. The army is justifiable in doing anything in the name of the state that is for its benefit.

While Germany carried the Darwinian method to a fearful extreme the other nations were also largely under its influence and control. While self-defense may be urged as an extenuating circumstance and while they were no doubt restrained to an extent by Christian ideas and humane principles, yet the other nations also raised large armies and increased their naval equipment; sought to increase their physical power and to enlarge their dominions by conquering tribes, adding lands to their domains and establishing colonies in foreign countries. The United States refrained from doing so, not however because it was not actuated by the same general ideas which controlled the other nations, but because it already possessed all the territory and resources it needed and was so situated geographically that it needed to fear no enemy. Had it been in the same circumstances as England, France, Italy or Japan its course would in all probability have been like unto theirs. For consciously or unconsciously the idea of the survival of the fittest largely held sway in the mind of America.

The same competition and struggle came to exist also in the sphere of economics—in business and trade. Each leading nation was striving to obtain the largest portion of the business and commerce of the world; each tried to exceed the others; each sought to be strongest and fittest. Diplomacy became smart dealing. The *Westminster Gazette* in 1911 said of diplomats in dealing with international affairs—"We see them pulling wires, stealing marches on one another, laying long and crafty plans which almost invari-

¹ Quoted by Prof. Kidd in *The Science of Power*, pp. 76 and 173.

ably miscarry, and missing obvious events which throw all their designs into confusion. And on the one side or the other there is a perpetual exploiting of the inherent loyalty and patriotism of their countries in quarrels which are mere combativeness for no purpose."²

In other spheres, too, force is resorted to for the accomplishment of the ends of the individual or the class. In the long standing struggle between labor and capital force is employed on both sides. Capital often seeks to keep labor in subjection by such force as labor cannot resist. And labor seeks to organize itself into one great Federation in order that by general united action it may compel capital to yield to its demands. It is force against force. In our opinion there is much more involved in this struggle than is generally apprehended. It seems to be a deep-seated irrepressible conflict. Fundamentally it represents individualism, selfishness, the resort to force, the aim of the survival of the fittest. It proceeds on the same principles by which the nations were led until they arrived at their Armageddon in 1914 to 1918, which resulted in their practical bankruptcy. Will this conflict between capital and labor go on until they end in a similar catastrophe or will it be possible for business to become established on a new basis and peace to prevail between these two interests?

From the foregoing considerations it is manifest that the last great war grew out of the general spirit, aims and operations of the nations and people of the civilized world. Not one nation alone but all of the nations were to blame for it. While some cherished the humane spirit and were led by Christian feelings more than others, yet all of them were more or less under the influence of the theory of natural selection and the survival of the fittest, and all sought to become efficient for their own own interests. Germany became predominantly culpable because she was most deeply steeped in Darwinism.

² *The Science of Power*, p. 17.

Evolution as an explanation of life from its lowest to its highest form we believe to be firmly established. It seems to us to be true to the facts as far as they have been discovered. But the Darwinian *method* by which evolution is supposed to be brought about is being seriously questioned. Natural selection is regarded as entirely insufficient to account for the origin of species, and the survival of the fittest inadequate to cause the process from the lower to the higher. They no doubt are contributing factors in the evolutionary process but do not constitute the fundamental power producing the process. Many scientists and others will no doubt continue to hold to Darwinism in all its fullness. In reference to them, J. D. Beresford in his introduction to Dr. Geley's book, *From the Unconscious to the Conscious*, says: "For them Charles Darwin is still the splendid discoverer of man's origin and they dread the coming of the finer and more inclusive theory of Being which will turn Darwin's *Descent of Man*, and the *Origin of Species* into interesting relics of an old and superseded mode of thought."

Dr. Gustave Geley, Director of the "*Institut Metapsychique International*" holds that natural selection, the survival of the fittest and individual inheritance do not sufficiently explain the origin and development of life. They fall far short of accomplishing the ends which they have been made to subserve. They are factors that contribute to the process of evolution, but if there were not something more fundamental and potent the process would collapse. And the array of facts which Dr. Geley and others of like conviction present seem to the mind of a layman to be conclusive for their contention. The positive view of Dr. Geley will appear from a few extracts from his book, *From the Unconscious to the Conscious*, as follows: "The mystery becomes clearer only if it be admitted that above the metamorphoses, above the organic and physiological modifications and the revolutions in the chemical equilibrium of life there

exists the directive dominant of a superior dynamic."³ Dr. Geley quotes the following from Flammarion: "The purely mechanical concept of nature is insufficient; there is more in the universe than matter. It is not matter that governs the world, but a dynamic and psychic element." To this, Dr. Geley adds: "This is so, the ideoplastic materializations demonstrate that the living being can no longer be considered as a mere cellular complex. It appears primarily as a dynamo-psychism, and the cellular complex which is its body appears as the ideoplastic product of this dynamo-psychism."⁴ It is a source of much comfort to us that some learned scientists are setting forth the psychic element in life, as that furnishes us with a better conception of the human soul than that of the materialistic psychology which has been so boldly prevalent of late years. The soul employs the body as its instrument and not the reverse. It is not the arm that strikes, but I strike using the arm. It is not the foot that walks, but I walk. It is not the brain that thinks but I think by using the brain. The brain is the instrument of the soul.

Instead of the term dynamo-psychism why does Dr. Geley not designate the power which causes life to evolve into species, families and individuals the creative power of God lodged by the author of all life in its being? He answers, because that would make God the author of evil of which the world is so full on all sides. But whence the origin of his dynamo-psychism, or the beginning of life? Dr. Geley's dilemma will remain unless God be ruled entirely out of the world from beginning to end. The existence of evil is a large and difficult subject the discussion of which does not belong to the purpose of this paper.

But if natural selection, the fittest, the efficient individual, physical force, are not to control the human world, what is to do so? The social idea. We do not mean socialism as

³ *From the Unconscious to the Conscious*, p. 48.

⁴ P. 67.

a political party which aims at the organization of a new form of government. Any form of government that is compelled to execute its decrees by the application of force would leave civilization just where it now is. But we mean that the social idea is to take the place of the individual idea. No man liveth unto himself alone but also unto society of which he is a part; no nation liveth unto itself alone but also unto the world of which it is a part. No individual is to be efficient in his own interests alone but also in the interest of his fellowmen; and no class of persons is to have regard only for its own welfare. When the government with its subjects is controlled by the social ideal it does not matter what its form may be. Let it not be forgotten that when we come to mankind we enter the sphere of mind, and the mind is more than simple reason; more than pure intellect. Reason is not the greatest power in man. Love, kindness, sympathy, mercy, the sense of right and of goodness, these are the moral powers, growing out of man's emotional nature, which when given proper sway will accomplish more for the advancement of civilization than it is possible for reason to accomplish. This does not mean that the intellectual and emotional natures are to be divorced. They cannot be, they are organically united. But the emotional must be allowed to assert itself.

The signs are hopeful for a change of conditions in the world. Theodore Roosevelt by his teaching and transaction brought about some improvement in the economic condition of our country and caused the people to entertain new ideas in regard to the social relations of men. Woodrow Wilson by his various messages and proclamations brought new conceptions to the foreground with reference to the relation of nation to each other. In the main his ideals were right and good, and met with a receptive response on the part of the people of the world. The Washington Conference on the limitation of armaments is in line with his conceptions and follows

in the wake of his ideals. And as the nations of the earth gain clearer visions peace and good will among men will be more fully realized. It is however to be regretted that the representatives of some of the nations in the Washington Conference by their words and actions showed that they were yet largely in the grasp of the old selfish and individualistic conception of men and nations. And by some of the people in our country nationalism is emphasized and the cry is raised "America First." Such words sound very much like "Deutschland über Alles." Such sentiments may not have much significance in our country but years ago they had a large meaning in Germany full of dire consequences. Loyalty to one's self, to one's family and to one's country when properly entertained is a virtue; but when it is of a purely selfish nature it is a vice. We are hopeful of the position which the United States and its people will take in the changing conditions of the present age.

But our greatest hope is in the Church. Christian men and women have a vision of the social ideal such as others do not possess. This is manifested in the prosecution of missions in which no difference is made between race or color, nation or tribe, high or low, rich or poor, but the effort is made to bring the blessings of the Gospel and of Christian civilization to each and all alike. The missionaries throughout the world are laboring everywhere to establish peace among men and among nations. National federation of churches and international Christian alliances will have a significance in the future such as they did not possess in the past and will be instrumental in begetting in the minds of men considerations for mankind and thoughts for the welfare of the world. The Red Cross, a by-product of the Church, is commending itself to all men everywhere by its ministrations to the needy and suffering wherever they may be found and is creating a fraternal spirit among all men. The Church as a whole never in all her history ministered

so cheerfully and so liberally to the suffering and perishing as she did the past ten years. All this will have a salutary effect upon the Church herself and quicken the social ideal in the mind of the world. When this social ideal becomes clearly fixed in the mind and is followed by nations in their operations and by men in their economic relations, then will a state of civilization be produced in which all can rejoice. This result will not be accomplished in a day or a decade. But if the ideal will be pursued from generation to generation, blessed results will follow.

The sceptical may call the foregoing *Utopianism*. Mr. H. G. Wells has been quoted as saying: "The human mind has always accomplished progress by its construction of Utopias." The man who has ideals and pursues them persistently accomplishes something. The man with no ideals remains on a low level. There are low ideals, false and spurious ideals. But there are also high and true and good ideals. It took Darwinism more than fifty years and at last a terrible catastrophe to reveal its failure as a method of civilization. No one questions the noble nature and beneficent quality of the social ideal. It seeks not the selection and fitness of the few, but its aim is to make all men fit, to strengthen the weak, to instruct the ignorant and cause all to become efficient, each according to the measure of his gifts. The human body is the illustration of humanity as it is to be developed. There is to be one body with many members. And there will be systems. Members will be large and small; some will be more important, some less. But it will be suicidal for the members to seek to destroy each other. The whole consists of all the parts. The different parts are to perform their functions with reference to the welfare of the whole.

SOMERSET, PA.

IV

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF WORK

DAVID DUNN

INTRODUCTION: CHARACTER, PURPOSE AND METHOD

What follows is neither fish nor fowl, neither historical study nor philosophical analysis, still less a program for a day's work or an industrial order, ribbed and pointed with statistics. Our purpose is not scientific but photographic; we have tried to portray *a family group*. And the family, our own human family, has been snapped in a far different collective pose from anything you have ever seen within the gilt frames that hang in parlor bedrooms. That starched, strained, "watch-the-birdie" look, that martyrous effort of every individual to suppress all individuality and bear all manner of discomfort and humiliation for the sake of the final appearance of the group—all that is missing. Indeed some of the members are either quite ignorant of, or at least indifferent to, the very existence of the others. And where their attitudes do involve the presence of others, they run the whole gamut of emotion from love through pity to scorn and hatred with greetings and grimaces that photographers see only in their wildest dreams. While "the birdie," to which they naturally adjust themselves in thought and word and action, is not some mysterious nothing within the lenses but that intensely real something which, willy-nilly, intrudes into their lives, that something known as "WORK."

To catch the expressions on lip and face and life of some of the various members of this modern family, as they meet and deal with work and to judge them in the light of their elder Brother, commissioned by the Father of the household to reveal and represent Him to the Family Circle, this

is the body of our task, out of which, not as a formal code or settled dogma but as a Group of Living Principles, there will emerge, we hope, what we shall have the right to call: "The Christian View of Work."

Now let us proceed to focus the camera of our attention upon successive members of this family group that we may see personified before us certain typical views by *the sons of men* regarding work:

I. WORK—IN ITS INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS (LABOR).

(a) *Varieties of Conceptions:*

I. *Four purely secular attitudes toward work as a merely individual matter:* Enter one after another, four persons with names of no biblical derivation: Dick-son, Robert-son, Harri-son and Ed-son.

Dickson hates work in and of itself and just naturally dodges it whenever possible. He may be the "weary-willy" of the road who fades from your back-door at the first suspicion of a wood-pile. Or he may be the young "sport-about-town," too heavily endowed by parental unwisdom. A "Miss Dickson," fluttering between bridge and dancing, once caught sight of "The Gleaners" hanging on the wall of a friend. "O horrors," she exclaimed, "that picture always gives me the backache." Be they rich or poor, male or female, work to the Dicksons just doesn't figure save as a scourge to be fled at all costs.

Robertson doesn't remember his first introduction to Work. Before there were child labor laws he was a breaker boy in the Anthracite, picking slate for long hours that his pittance might make the family's total income sufficient. Manhood and marriage changed neither his place of work nor his view of it, only the nature of his job and the objects of his support. Work to him had always been symbolized by the hideous bleak colliery looming against a leaden sky. Yes, he knows work all too well and he hates it as the spirited horse the spur and bridle as on he must go or suffer. Should he sing of his work, it would be like Hood's "Song

of the Shirt." President Dennis Driscoll of the Boston Central Labor Union in an address in Faneuil Hall, several years ago, recalled the fact to his audience of thousands of working men that Dr. Eliot, then President of Harvard, had spoken the previous Sunday in the same hall on "The Joy of Work." Then he paused and "wave after wave of derisive laughter swept the assemblage."¹ The very idea to the Robertsons was a bitter joke.

Meet, now, *Harrison*, a type of average white-collar Americans, the Harry Haydock of "Main Street" or the Raymie Wutherspoon, his clerk. "Fair" profits, "decent" wages, a boss who is tolerable if you keep quiet: these may or may not be his. Anyway he takes his work for granted, accepts it, gets through with it, draws his envelope, pays his bills and out of the residue sends his insurance premium and goes to the movies. For future satisfactions he is willing to endure both the aggravations and the boredom of the day.

And *Edson*: We've removed the letter "i" from the name, lest you think too exclusively of that famed ego of Menlo Park, who illustrates the type but doesn't exhaust its possibilities. Artist or expert, Edson may be, or student of solar spots or the aged caretaker who mows the lawn as he thinks no one but he can do, whoever he may be, Work to him is not only the process of life but its reward. How can an Edson like Dr. Eliot be expected to understand the loathing or the patient submission that many feel toward work when to him it's a spirited, adventurous game, fraught with surprises and sheer delight? Thus Angela Morgan sings:

Work.

Thank God for the pride of it,
For the beautiful conquering tide of it,
Sweeping the life in its furious flood,
Thrilling the arteries, cleansing the blood.
O what is so good as the urge of it?
And what is so glad as the surge of it?
And what is so kind as the stern command
Challenging brain and heart and hand?

¹ R. C. Cabot, *What Men Live By*, p. 21.

Any one of these four types might conceivably be a member of the church. Harrison likely is; less probably, Robertson; still less Edson, with Dickson's probability trailing far behind. Yet no one of them owes much, directly at least, to the Christian contribution to the Philosophy of Work. In their conceptions the religious motive and meaning are far from primary.

II. *Introducing the Christian view of work as a purely individual matter:* In contrast we make the acquaintance of another member of our family group, to whom we give a name reminiscent of him whom the records show to have been the Master's first-called disciple. Andrew seems to have taken his calling seriously from the first. In the few glimpses we have of him: bringing his own brother to his new Master, finding the boy whose lunch was to feed the multitude; announcing the visit of the Greeks to Jesus, he seems to have related his everyday life very closely to his Master's mission. So we choose a Twentieth Century spiritual descendant, *Anderson*, to present the Christian conception of Work in its individual aspects.

His convictions root in that undying saying of His Master: "My Father worketh even until now and I work." Anderson reverently adds: "And I work." His business (say he is a tinner, repairing rain-spouts, soldering tea-kettles) he regards as given to him by the Supreme Worker. He sees it in its relation to the fulfilment of Jesus' will just as Andrew did. A leaking gutter—a damp room—a cold—sickness—misery—so runs the association in his mind, a train of consequences subversive of God's will for any home. So the very heat of the sun as it blazes upon him at work upon the roof seems as the force and warmth of His Father's blessing. To him as to Henry van Dyke

This is the gospel of labor, ring it, ye bells of the kirk.

The Lord of Love came down from above, to live with the men who work.

This is the rose that He planted, here in the thorn-curst soil:
Heaven is blest with perfect rest, but the blessing of Earth is toil.²

Such a man in contact and contrast with the four types previously presented throws the defects and limitations of their views of work into sharp relief.

Were *Dickson* the least bit sensitive, his failure to play his part as a worker would make him most uneasy in *Anderson's* presence. Paul's application of Jesus' principle: "If any would not work, neither let him eat," would embitter in his mouth the hand-out from the kitchen or the cock-tail at the club. He would see Christ through *Anderson's* example looking upon him as on the barren fig-tree, giving him his last chance: "If thou bearest fruit henceforth, well; if not, thou shalt be cut down" (Lk. 13: 9).

Quite different are the reactions between *Anderson* and *Robertson*: The former may be shocked at first by the savage bitterness with which the miner speaks of his work, but he is too vibrant with His Master's sympathy not to look for facts that may explain it. Though he does not plumb the depths of social causes, he recognizes the actual difference between *Robertson's* work and his own and the historic difference in their experience of toil. When *Robertson* quotes from Gen. 3: to prove that work is imposed on mankind as a curse, *Anderson* will speak of Him who was esteemed "stricken, smitten of God and afflicted" as the one

Who cancels the curse of Eden,
And brings them a blessing instead:
Blessed are they that labor,
For Jesus partakes of their bread.
He puts His hand to their burdens,
He enters their homes at night:
Who does his best shall have as a guest
The Master of life and light.³

Yet when he has said all this he will go away feeling that he has not fully met the other's grievance, sorrowing that some must toil under such embittering conditions and pray-

² *The Toiling of Felix—Envoie.*

³ *Van Dyke, Toiling of Felix—Envoie.*

ing that somehow the might of God will prevail to set things right.

Anderson beside Harrison shows thoughtfulness measured with thoughtlessness. The attitude of the latter composite person is something like this: "No work, no money. So I'll stand it till the whistle blows and then the fun." While *Anderson's*: "Whether I eat or drink or work or whatsoever I do may I do it unto the Lord. My work may be humble, limited in influence but it cannot be insignificant to God for He gave it to me. Hence it shall not be uninteresting to me. As a part of God's great plan I shall strive to do it as best I can."

It is this same conviction that empowers the lowly tinner to confront *Edson*, the Apostle of Work, with the sense of having something which he lacks. He who works for work's sake, thrilled by the competition with, and the conquest of, natural and human forces, is apt to grow self-centered and arbitrary unless he daily acknowledges in some way the Source of his power. So in the life-light of the untutored disciple something seems missing in the careers of some of the world's most prodigious and successful workers: the window open toward Jerusalem, communion with that Householder, Lord of far countries as of our own, who gives to His sons the stewardship of pounds and power.

(b) *Limitations of the Foregoing (Individualist) Conceptions:*

From what has preceded it is clear that no one of the gentlemen whom we have met so far has much of what we have come in these days to style "Social Vision." Work to them is *their* work, their individual relation to labor with a small "I," not the work of the whole human family nor any large division of it.

Dickson's pronouncements on industrial questions are the glib flip catch-words of his class. If he is of the idle rich he may be depended upon to honk himself hoarse in running some "wobbly" out of town in the name of "law and order."

If he belongs to the idle poor he will surely seek to excuse his own laziness with talk of millionaires and profiteers for whom he's not going to slave his life away, not if he knows himself.

Robertson's social outlook will likely begin and end with his local of the U. M. W. of A., his one line of defense against the bosses. When a strike is voted he wields it as the only weapon which he and his buddies have, though it blisters and cuts his own hands in the wielding. But as for the Mingo conflict, the campaigns of the English miners, his own leaders' policies, they have an interest to him faint in comparison with his own life-problem of getting enough from his job for his family to live. The operators in general, his boss in particular are bloodless yet bloody forces bearing heavily against him and beyond his own struggle to keep level he knows little of the battle for Social Justice.

As for *Harrison*, he belongs to that vast and much-pitied throng whom economists denominate "the consumer," and the newspapers eulogize as "the public," ground between the mill-stones of industrial strife. Taking his work for granted as a means to certain future private ends, his lack of "class-consciousness" is the despair of the agitator and the bulwark of the status quo. His is "a position," not a "job." He belongs to the "staff" or the "office force" not to Labor with a big "L." The issues of the industrial and all social conflicts are matters of varying indifference to him. *His* rent and taxes are paid. The Pirates still lead the league. Harding's in the White House. All's right with the world.

Nor is that joyous Apostle of Work, named Edson, likely to have much concern for the general conditions of the world's work as they base and provoke social unrest. As he beams, firm-jawed and smooth-shaven, upon us from the glossy pages of "The American Magazine" he tells us how to climb and succeed, how to economize our energies, how to make work seem like play, how to select and handle

our men, etc. But on the principles of social justice he is suavely vague or fiercely opinionated. So much satisfaction and creative joy does he find in *his* work that he cannot but suspect that the embroglio he sees in industry is caused either by sinister and alien influences or else by the failure of the individual workers to approach their work in the right spirit and to make the most of their advantages.

And we must have felt that there were limits even to Anderson's application of His Master's Gospel. Well does he understand how it applies to a man's own mind and hands but how it pertains to Industry, the activity and support of great groups and classes of men he cannot clearly comprehend. Remember how he turned perplexed and sorrowful from the grievances of Robertson? Is it fanciful in this connection to recall that there were some heights of privilege and vision to which Andrew did not accompany his Leader. Not that Jesus chose arbitrarily not to take him but that he was not qualified nor ready for the added range of revelation. His one talent, though well used, had not yet fitted him for the wider view.

2. WORK—IN ITS SOCIAL ASPECTS—INDUSTRY.

It was to three others of the Master's little band that the opportunity was given to see Him in new and wide relations to the Law and the Prophecy of His nation (Moses and Elijah) and to the Supreme Ruler of Heaven's Kingdom. "This is My beloved Son. Hear Him" (Mark 9: 2-9). So today there are disciples, led by His Spirit up the slopes of some Horeb of Christian education and understanding to a point whence they can view—if they will—the social relationships of men the world around and the bearing upon them of the Savior's Words and Work. From these modern followers we will choose three types, three more members of our family group, to whom we shall give names betokening a spiritual genealogy: PETERSON, JAMESON and JOHN-SON.

(a) *Imperfect Views of the Relation of Men in Industry:*

I. *Views professedly Christian.*—We said they could from their vantage ground see, *if they would*, the problems and the struggles in the World of Work in the light of their Master's Gospel. To what extent do they meet His hopes and their opportunities?

Peterson seems dizzied by the altitude and dazed by the far expanse of land and sky. The glimpse of another world, coming on the clouds, seems to have claimed and chained his vision. A government official through much of his life but now retired with a goodly competence he knows the ins and outs, the crooks and bends of the world below. Indeed he has seen too much and considers the present world beyond redemption. Hence the relief with which he gets up and away from all its sordidness and sin, and his conviction that all must be made new by a sudden and supernatural substitution of a new order for the old. "What matters," he urges, "if the conditions of work down there are not what Christ would have them? It's only for the moment. The trumpet soon to sound will make all things new in the twinkling of an eye and what efforts any of us may have made to reform or reconstruct will prove altogether vain. Rather let us wait here and watch and pray." Through all of *Peterson's* words can we not catch the echo of that old appeal: "Master, it is good for us to be here; let us make three tabernacles," etc., *that* in the face of all the woe that moved the Christ to tears and all the work he had for his disciples to see and do.

But now *Jameson* is speaking—an elder in the church is he and a man interested in every sense in the world of business and finance, an employer of thousands, a director of great enterprises, his pockets bulging with stockholders' proxies. "Not a bit of it, *Peterson!*" he thunders with decision. "Our business is down there in the workaday world.

We're part of it, responsible for it. God meant us to be. Ours is the right from Him to promote, capitalize, direct the work of mankind, to make our money grow and talk, remembering our stewardship the while by bountifully supporting the Church and philanthropic work of every kind. And we're all the more needed down there now"—and here the vanguard of a frown flits to his face—"to defend our Christian civilization against the revolution and anarchy that threaten it."

II. *Non-religious view—Marxian.*—Our eyes following Jameson's now angry glance we glimpse another figure, slowly clambering up a nearby hill. His clothes and hands and face are torn by the brambles of persecution but in his eyes is a bright metallic light. Now he pauses, surveys the vales of humanity below and cries in a fierce and rasping voice: "Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains." His effect upon such types as we've come to know is varied and interesting. *Dickson* yawns and shouts back with an oath: "Dry up, you Red." *Harrison* starts a little, shakes off a shiver and remarks carelessly to his wife: "That's *Carlson*, the agitator. Ought to string him up." *Edson* slams down the window of his laboratory as he would against the agonies of a Ford trying to start. *Anderson* may cross himself or add a petition to his Litany. It is only *Robertson* who listens with interest. Something in *Carlson's* argument seems to meet and clasp hands with something in his own drab and cruel experience. It is this effect that Jameson is quick to notice from the mountain side and he foams with fury. The *Robertsons* are digging his coal, driving his teams, tending his looms and to have their minds thus poisoned and upstirred—but you know the line of his outburst. You can read it in the "Pittsburgh Inquirer" or the "Philadelphia Gazette-Times" most any morning, unfailingly at times of labor troubles, not only as editorials but as news! (forbear to smile). Or Mr. Gary or Mr. Atterbury will mail it to you from their offices,

gratis and unasked. And almost invariably do these Jamesons fail to distinguish between the Carlsons and the constructive leaders of Union Labor who represent, if anything too cautiously, the aspirations of the rank and file. All are grouped and condemned as foes of business and the public.

Carlson knows the difference. He attacks the union leaders more bitterly than the Kings of Capital, as traitors to the working class. He answers Jameson's fire with fire of his own. His "line" you may pick from your doorstep early some Sunday morning or you may read it in a press that, thanks to Burlesons and Palmers, reaches a far wider public every year. Scathing attack on all "bourgeois" ideas and institutions with venomous shafts for organized religion, accused of trying to reconcile the Robertsons to their slavish lot by promises of "pie in the sky, by and by."

Thus between hill and hill there darts the lightning and peals the thunder of class-war, threatening with annihilation the world's fund of goodwill, already so terribly depleted, recrucifying the Master-Workman of Nazareth. And for Him is there no one else to speak?

(b) *The Christian View of Industry:*

I. *Introduction (personification).*—There was a third disciple witnessing the transfiguration, who knew an intimacy with Jesus unsurpassed. The reference to him as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" can only mean that he, beyond the measure of the rest, understood and appreciated the love of Christ for man. It was of him that Peter at the Supper begged that he should find out for the rest the mind of Jesus. Could we appeal to him across the centuries, we might know much more than now we do as to how Jesus viewed the problems of his day, the question of work among them. But as for the probable attitude He would take toward the issues of industrial life right now, we would still be left

to the Spirit's guidance in the interpretation and application of those broad principles which His Teaching and Example then embodied. Yet surely it is fitting that the last member of our family group who shall present to us the view of Industry that rings truest to the principles of Christ should be a Christian school teacher named *Johnson*, a man as plain and humble as his name, yet a student of humanity whose livelihood and meager savings have been but incidental products of his life-work, building personalities. Full well he knows the weaknesses of men, ever recalling the extent to which he shares them. Standing on the mountain-side he looks across the stretching world as if to better understand the vastness and the wholeness of the task, then looks upward as if for orders and inspiration. But unlike Peterson's, his gaze does not remain aloft and afar but returns to reckon with the persons and ideas at hand.

II. *Contrast and conflict with dominant conception.*—He hails the irate Jameson: "Hold, Brother, calm yourself! Let's try to look at the whole matter, as far as we can, through the eyes of our Master who has led us thus far up the hill and given us this wider view. Forget for a while the fellow over yonder. He has not had our advantages. We do not know enough of his origin and the thorny path by which he has climbed to judge him. His hill doesn't give him the same view that ours, thanks to our Leader, *can* give to us.

"Don't tell me about him," growls Jameson, "I've known his stripe these many years. Talk to him, not me."

"Talk is not what he needs; much less repression," insisted Johnson. "Our one way to silence him is to change the conditions of which he is a symptom. Not voices like his but Injustice is the only agitator with whom we need to deal. Could we but fashion Industry on lines laid down by Him whom we profess, we'd have nought to fear from Carlson."

"Come now," retorted Jameson, "don't mix religion and business. One Steel Strike report is quite enough." "Don't drag Christ into this affair."

"We don't need to. He has always been in it and always will be. Have you ever counted how many of his parables and shorter sayings have to do with work and money? And even aside from that, isn't His Gospel for the whole man all the time, for the man at the bench or the desk as well as for the same men in the fifth pew back?"

"That's well enough as far as a man's individual work goes. I believe every man should do a day's honest work just as Anderson does it, as if God were looking right at him. But when it comes to business and industry on a big scale you've got a huge system and complex forces over which no one has full control. . . ."

"But aren't we given our five or ten talents of money or power or vision to cope with just that; to use just as faithfully and God-consciously in our wider field as Anderson uses his one talent in his smaller one? Are we as employers or investors or educators doing it?"

Jameson yawns: "O, I guess we're trying to do the right thing as far as the game allows."

"But what of the game itself?" presses Johnson. "Haven't we a responsibility for its being what it is? Surely it isn't perfected, all lines and rules laid down for life everlasting? Are you satisfied with it? Believe me, I'm not! In many respects I regard the whole system as a denial of the claims of Christ upon men."

Jameson looks blank. "How do you get that?" he asks testily.

"Very simply," is the reply. "One glance at the New Testament, another at industry today are quite sufficient. Christ taught and lived certain principles for Man's whole social life, industry included. The Church has lately been proclaiming them with a new vigor.⁴ Any Christian con-

⁴ *The Church and Industrial Reconstruction*, pp. 10-11.
The Social Creed of the Churches—1908.

ception of work must involve them. They blend through each other in steady progress:

"A. Reverence for all kinds of human personality is the fundamental starting point. You know Christ's attitude toward 'the least of these' whether they were the little children playing at his feet or the leper, the publican, the adulteress. No one was too low in any scale for Him to regard and touch and help. He recognized in each a God-implemented spirit and he held it sacred. Is that the attitude of the world of work down there? Isn't a person's labor considered just a commodity to be bought and used till it's used up just like lumber or coal (its price and treatment determined largely by the conditions of the labor market)? Can you see Jesus sanctioning a system that breeds such conceptions? Isn't there one of His parables wherein He represents His Father as a large employer who takes groups of men on to His payroll at various times throughout the day and at quitting time pays them all according to their need and their willingness to work and not according to the amount of work extracted from them? Look down there at Robertson in the shaft and Harrison behind the counter! What do they mean to you? Dots that make up the total figure opposite the item 'wages' on your books? Or aspiring souls in perspiring bodies? And how much less do they mean to the goodly folks who in distant comfort clip coupons from the product of others' toil?"

Here Jameson broke in weakly with a protest: "But you can't keep the personal touch in industry today. It's too big, too complex."

"God knows it's hard. But does that excuse you from greater effort? Surely you can't remember all the names but you can acquaint yourself with a few types, their home-life, their interests and their hopes. How often do employers know the ramifying pedigrees of a full stable or the comparative merits of a hundred motor cars and practically

nothing about the men in their mills! Harder? Yes. But how much more vitally necessary! To what end? That you may do all that is possible to give to all workers whose conditions of labor you may influence the best chance possible to develop their personalities. Production, I know, is and should be the aim and end of Industry but production not only of tires and turbines but of human intelligence, skill and character. Look for example at Robertson. You wonder why he's so touchy and so sullen, so susceptible to the arguments of Carlson. Do you understand what he needs for a rounded development along lines of healthy Christian citizenship and to what extent these needs are ignored?

"He needs *regular work*. The fear of unemployment and the family disaster it is likely to bring is ever unsettling him, to say nothing of the frequent fulfilment of that fear. Christ expects you and me to help answer the prayer now on the millions' lips: 'Give us this day our daily job.'

"Then he needs a *living wage*, such returns for his labor as will secure for him and his, not merely a bare subsistence but something in addition for culture and recreation, for his children's education and for a rampart 'gainst the stormy day." Wages, not dividends, should be the first charge on industry.

"Another thing that thwarts his development is *too long hours* of work. Labor of his kind can be continued past the eight hour line only with fatigue which not only lessens his productiveness but makes the fruitful use of his 'off-time' impossible. And often his Sabbath which the Savior said was made for him must be turned over to King Coal or Kaiser Steel.

"Then there are certain *conditions of his work* which violate the rights of his body and his soul. Would you want your father or your son to face them—not just for vacation periods but life in, life out? Would you yourself fancy

breathing that emery dust and working all day by that unguarded machine? Would you consider that your person was being respectfully, to say nothing of reverently, treated? Yet one more thing he needs: the assurance that his wife and children will not have to work when they're physically unable and that when they do work their welfare will be safeguarded. One winter when he was sick, his wife had to take his place as bread-winner. And now his boys as soon as they reach the legal age, sometimes before, must be fitted into the grooves of the great machine. There's Harrison's daughter in the 'Five-and-ten,' forbidden to sit down except at lunch time. What think you, Jameson? Does Industry's present use of *women and children* express a reverence for the spirits of the future?"

"Yes, I've heard that before," sighs our elder-employer, "and I want to assure you that we are not so callous toward these human values as you would have folks think. Our 'Safety First' system has done more than all your factory laws to protect life and limb. By writing for our employees insurance policies far better than they could get from old-line companies, by conducting savings-banks right in the shops we are helping them to prepare for old age and hard times and to provide for their families. We give them bonuses while they work and pensions when they reach the age of retirement. Through Grievance Committees all real wrongs are righted and a wholesome contact is maintained between management and men. We realize as no one else how essential to production it is to have our workers well-kept and contented and we believe that our so-called 'American Plan' will bring far better results in that direction than any of your radical recipes for unrest now being proclaimed from soap-boxes—and some pulpits."

"Jameson," replied his brother-disciple, "I think I can read the Master's attitude toward you in the record of his treatment of a certain rich young man long ago. I believe that looking upon you now, he loves you for such things as

you have done to mitigate that savage exploitation of human life, once generally regarded as 'good business.' But would he not have to say to you also: '*One thing thou lackest.*' And that one thing is the grace to follow Him a little higher up the hill, carrying your reverence for the personalities of your workers over into a

"(B) *Practical recognition of human brotherhood*, of Robertson as in every sense but that of blood, your brother. O yes! Of course you admit that *in theory*. But wait till we see what it means in industrial practice! You have been doing what *you* think best for the good of your men but in the praiseworthy things you have done can you point out one step you have made beyond paternalism? And in going no farther can't you see how you lie exposed not only to the cynical thrusts of Carlson but, far worse, to the sustained hostility of Robertson who will be easily convinced that you talk 'Safety First' merely to keep down compensation claims and that you trim your company Christmas tree with the same spirit and purpose that moved second century Cæsars to provide for the populace the games in the arena. Now just a moment! Let me finish! I believe that to go the whole way with Jesus means that you will take His "Love thy neighbor as thyself" right into your daily relations with Robertson, Harrison and all the rest, that you will consider the parties to industry not as master and slave, operator and operative, employer and employee, but as brother and brother, partner and partner. As things stand now the statement so often made in would-be conciliatory speeches that the interests of Capital and Labor are identical is either an ignorant or a brazen lie. How can they be when each tries to get the most for the least? And how can it be otherwise as long as employees have no access to the books, no knowledge of the processes of industry save such as are mediated to them through the economic dogmatism of Carlson?

"Right here's where a real American Plan must be a Christian Plan. To call your scheme by either name is to insult

American Democracy or to libel Christianity. The Christian Plan whatever the details of its working-out will involve two things: The recognition of the right of Labor to organize *in its own way* not in yours, nationally as well as locally, and to confer with you through leaders of its own choosing. Would you deny to the workers their Morrisons and Maurers, their Jett Laucke and Glenn Plumbs when Capital has for years merged and combined and retained its Philander Knoxes and Elihu Roots for fabulous fees? What kind of bargaining would you expect between a single loom-fixer or weaver or a host of them without leadership or expert help of their own, and the American Woolen Company? Can you wonder that the strike has so often seemed the worker's only chance? *The other thing* which the Christian Plan involves is a progressive sharing of the knowledge, the control, the responsibilities and the fruits of Industry by those who invest their capital with those who invest their labor. This is the way of brotherhood, the only way of hope."

A most noticeable change has been coming over Jameson. His jaw protrudes more and more and his eyes are ablaze. "Never," he bursts forth. "Right there's the rub. We will not be dictated to in our business, least of all by outside agitators. And this talk of 'joint control' and 'industrial democracy' is the stuff of dreams. They who run the risks and bear the brunt must control the business in the primary interest of those who put their money in it. Here we stand. We cannot give an inch"—and a great deal more of very angry talk in which words like "Russia," "North Dakota," "visionary" and "anarchist" crackle like pine knots in a fire.

"Softly," pleads Johnson. "Your every word helps Carlson in his propaganda, makes more radicals than he himself could make in a twelve-month. I feared it would be hard for you to take this further step up the mountain path to where you could regard your employees as brothers in every sense. But consider the alternative: Growing misunder-

standing, hardening of class lines and social distinctions based on industrial functions, ever more unequal distribution of the fruits of toil, ever bitterer conflict until the day—postpone it decade after decade, it is sure to come—when the majority will assert their claim with might, maybe with torch and gun. And you—But enough of this! Far rather would I commend to you on its own positive merits 'a more excellent way,' a way that leads on through this recognition of brotherhood to the beholding of a Heavenly Vision.

"*C. The vision of industry*—the world-process of production not as a mechanism in the hands of a privileged few for the wringing of maximum profits from Nature and Humanity but as an *Institution of Mutual Service* in which all invest their portion—be it of brain or brawn or bank-notes—the responsibility as well as the rewards of which all share in Christian Equity. You call it a dream. In the same sense, The Kingdom of God as Christ preached it was a dream but a dream that can come true. And what you think is my dream is an integral part of that. Thank God I can dream and strive to fulfil my dreams!"

Jameson's wrath was reaching a climax: "In your position you've entirely too good a chance for that kind of thing. I may feel it my patriotic duty to speak to our local School Board."

It was Johnson's eyes that flashed now: "I hope you read of the New York preacher who in the name of multitudes of his ministerial brethren flung back in the teeth of just such a threat: 'Before high God, not for sale!'"

"But can't you see," hurried the other, more mildly, "that you're doing just what no one who presumes to speak for Christ has any right to do. You're taking sides."

"Anyone who protests against a wrong may be so accused by those who do not or will not see the wrong. Do not think that I see only wrong on one side and only right on the other. Jesus opposed deceit and injustice wherever he saw it. But read Luke's version of the Beatitudes if you

think he never took sides. We cannot fully explain the rancor and hatred with which he was regarded by the economic and ecclesiastic 'ins' of His day unless we understand with what whole-souled vigor He championed the rights of the 'outs,' the exploited and the dispossessed."

"But why," asked Jameson somewhat wearily, "do you do all your protesting to me? What of these other fellows? Save some of your thunder for them."

"You," answered Johnson, "are now at the steering wheel of Industry. Yours is the first move. But be assured that the Christian view of work has a meaning and a message for every one. Nor shall I hesitate at any opportunity to be just as frank and explicit with the rest.

"III. *Application to all preceding views.*—A. To the men on the plain below I need say but one thing more than Anderson has already told them, viz., that Work is more than an individual matter, something between a man and himself or his boss or even his God, that it has a bearing on the lives of his fellow-workmen throughout the world and upon that vague yet vital something we call society or civilization, which when finally and thoroughly Christianized will be that Kingdom which we pray may come.

"Would that I could drill and blast into Dickson's life the active truth that this Kingdom is essentially a kingdom of Work, that it knows no niche for a non-serving class.

"Would that I could make Robertson feel his part in Industry as Service as well as his place in the world-wide ranks of Labor, could make him look on his employer not so much as a personal enemy, an irresponsible oppressor, as a cog in a great machine in sore need of reconstruction, could cultivate in him patience, a breadth of understanding and the purpose to fit himself as he fights his battle (humanity's battle as well as his) for the responsibilities which new-won rights will bring—all this that he may rise from narrowness and craftcenteredness toward that statesmanship and uni-

versal sympathy which make leaders like Henderson and Smillie, bright hopes of a new day.

"As for *Harrison* this better vision would leave him no longer content to accept the rubber-stamped views of his boss or of the party clique or social set to which he clings. He will see that he cannot dismiss the claims of the restless under-world of toil with stock-phrases like 'Bolshevik.' Nor will he be satisfied with Industry as it is just because his salary has so far been able to withstand the monthly onslaught of his bills. He will set himself to study the broader aspects of the fact of Work and the bearing upon it of the Christian Gospel.

"Nor is *Edson's* view of Work such as will not profit from an infusion of the full evangel. He too needs to discover that Industry is something more than his office or laboratory on a larger scale, that his work will be no less but even more rewarding, when conceived not merely as the struggle of the blond beast of human intellect with the obstacles of environment but as the effort of a ten-talent servant of humanity to fulfil his obligation to his fellow-men.

"And *Anderson?* Much could I learn from him about Christian living and Christian thinking. But compared with our vista from the mountain his is a narrower outlook and a simpler problem. Faithful in a few things, the Lord will surely make him ruler of many so that he too in time will see that Christ is concerned and Christianity is involved not only in the way he does his work but in the way in which the work of Humanity is done.

"*B. Those on the hills.*—*Peterson's* in many ways is the saddest case of all. He with us has been led up to where he could take, if he would, the wider look. Yet he peers for that new world he thinks will come from above, when Christ himself assured us that such 'would not come with observation,' that its sproutings are within us. But let's try him once more: Ho, Peterson! do you hear me?" "Well,"

says the other impatiently without turning his face. "The Master needs us and our vision down there. Let's go!" "O don't bother me. Jesus is coming." "Our brother over there," resumed Johnson, "at least faces the facts of the present. Let's hail him. Ho, Carlson! Maybe we've misunderstood each other. Let's try to view things together!"

"Hypocrite," almost hisses the answer from the other hill. "Of the two of you I prefer the 'plute' by your side. He fights in the open and knows that it's war to the death, that one class or the other must rule while you are trying to confuse the issues under the cloak of religion which the masters have always used to fool and keep down their slaves. Away with you! You're all the more dangerous because so kindly-mannered and plausible. But you're too late with your salve. The die is cast. The proletariat will have none of you. Climb on where you belong."

"There," broke in Jameson with mingled amusement and triumph: "He gives you excellent advice. I repeat it. Climb on where you belong. He has cleared the issue: 'Civilization vs. Anarchy,' Religion against Atheism. Carlson must go or we."

"Remember," says Johnson quietly, "how our distant precursors called by their Master with gentle irony 'the sons of Thunder' wanted fire from heaven called down on such an opponent. There were crowds of such opponents in Christ's time, many of them zealots who, when they found that His Kingdom was not conceived in vengeance nor to be achieved in partisanshipness and violence, turned on him and helped to crucify the common people's dearest friend. Did he prosecute and persecute them? Did he malign and curse them? Did he humor James and John with a display of vindictive lightning? 'Father, forgive them for they know not what they do.' His Love," and Johnson raises his voice to carry to the opposite slope, "is sufficient to cope

with you too, Carlson. I pray that in your life a mightier than Marx will claim the Mastery!"

Then without waiting for reply he turns back to Jame-mon: "Well, brother, I suppose I must end as I began, with you. For after all, despite our differences we have more in common than have the others with us: Christ as an acknowledged Master, a vision of Industry in the large and great talents of influence, yours upon the situation of today, mine upon the ideas and characters of tomorrow. Forgive me if I have seemed severe and unappreciative of your efforts and your problems. Pardon one final summary of what I believe to be your opportunity.

"We have just been threatened with the waste and terror of class conflict. This need not come unless you want it and Robertson wants it. Robertson doesn't want it. He least of all has reason to want any war for from it he suffers most. He'll take 'almost any other way out.'

"Do you want it?

"If you do, go on as before. Insist on keeping Robertson in what you call 'his place,' fight his unions, smother his freedom of speech and assemblage. Spy on him and fire him if you suspect him of thinking for himself and you'll drive him right into the arms of Carlson's logic, convinced that he must fight you with body and soul till his class has wrested the rudder of industrial power from yours.

"If you don't want this struggle, acknowledge him as a brother and partner in work, respect his personality, collective as well as individual, open the books to him, share an ever larger degree of control and profits with him, thus giving him chance and preparation to assume an ever greater load of responsibility. And Carlson's voice will become like the screech owl's in the night, unable to attract or to alarm. And Industry will become one gigantic world-service to which all who engage in it shall contribute according to their ability and from which Mankind will draw its

life in proportion to its growing needs not only of stomach but of mind and soul."

Jameson sits moody and silent.

"Don't expect this view to invite and possess you in a moment through such an harangue as mine. There's but one way to get it, often a slow hard way because of the obstacles in us. Think yourself closer and closer to the Christ."

CONCLUSION

"Remember that 'acid' test to which He daily puts us: 'Inasmuch as ye do it unto the least of these my brethren' (the least in social distinction, the least in industrial power) 'ye do it unto me.'"

"And remember too his promise: 'Whoso loseth his life for My sake and the Gospel's shall find it.' Jameson, I am finding mine in teaching Christ and being taught Him by the grand-children of men. I dream again. In that new Democracy of Industry, in that new Brotherhood of those who toil, I see you losing of your power and profits, those things that seemed to you your very life, and therein finding Life eternal."

"I wonder," ponders Jameson.

"I believe—" begins Johnson, "but good-bye! the school bell rings."

TURTLE CREEK, PA.

V

"JEFFERY FARNOL"

C. JEFFERSON WEBER

In a certain New England library there stands, on the librarian's desk, a neat little wooden pedestal with the subscription "Have You Read This?"—"This" refers to the book mounted on the pedestal. The whole catches the eye of the reader as he enters the library, and seems to offer him at once a welcome and a feast.

On one of my recent visits to this treasury, I found Jeffery Farnol's "The Broad Highway" sitting like *Patience* on a monument. "You again!" I said to myself, and turning to the librarian asked, "Have you read much of Farnol?"—"Every word he has published, I think." The reply was made quietly and undemonstratively, just as one would say, "I have read all of Shakespeare," or "I have read every one of Scott's novels." The tone of voice seemed to say to me, "You surely wouldn't expect to find a live twentieth century librarian who hadn't devoured every crumb of manna bestowed on mortals by divine Jeffery Farnol?" It startled me.

I decided to investigate. A professor in an old New England college informed me that he thought that much of Farnol was as good as Dickens, and that, in many ways, the contemporary novelist was superior to the classic humorist. I inquired further, and received similar eulogies in reply. The harshest comment I was able to coax out of any one was that the characters are all alike—whether they spell their names Jeffery or Geoffrey—and that the events are slightly improbable.

Despairing of the older critics, I turned to the "younger generation," especially among college students of literature, and there again I met with unexpected admiration for the writings of Mr. Farnol. "He is my favorite novelist," "I do wish he'd write more; his books can't come fast enough for me," "I just love his romance," "Isn't he just glorious?" are examples of the apparently common attitude.

My own words, then, must be like "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." I stand on the Atlantic coast with a flabby broom, and vainly try to sweep back the wave of popularity advancing on us from England. Mr. Farnol, from his perch on top the wave, will laugh at my broom. In spite of my solitary position, however, I must set about sweeping. What earthly good, you ask? I reply, in the words of Stephen More (in Galsworthy's "The Mob"), so that "History won't say: And this he did without a single protest from our" reading public! Perhaps, after I am exhausted with my sweeping and my broom is worn to stubbles, they will put up a stone for me, as they did for Stephen More; and then Mr. Farnol will laugh at the epitaph! Perhaps the wave will sweep ironically on, and even submerge the tombstone! (It is only fair, however, to add that Professor Stuart P. Sherman of the University of Illinois, in his volume "On Contemporary Literature" (1917), fails even to mention Farnol, and that Professor John W. Cunliffe of Columbia University completely ignores Mr. Farnol in his recent (1919) book "English Literature during the Last Half Century.")

Other novelists before Mr. Farnol have been popular, and there have been reasons for their popularity. It cannot be amiss, then, to try to analyze the work of our contemporary, in order to lay the foundation for an equitable appreciation of him. Since his characters *are* all alike, it makes little difference which novel we select for detailed examination: let "The Definite Object" (his latest book) serve. This is

neither his best nor his worst book. "The Money Moon" is perhaps as good—or bad, and doubtless "The Broad Highway" and "The Amateur Gentleman" are more meritorious. On the other hand, "My Lady Caprice," "The Honorable Mr. Tawnish," and the curious "Smith" are less readable.

Geoffrey Ravenslee, the hero of "The Definite Object," is easily described. He is "the well-known sportsman and millionaire, winner of last year's International Automobile race," and a champion boxer; he drinks, and smokes, and has other habits which make him "smell like a man." He was about to commit suicide to escape from his superfluous wealth, when he fell in love.

The heroine is sweet, and kind, and affectionate, and demure, and modest, and energetic, and fair to behold. She likes flowers and green fields and sick children, and hates Bowery gentlemen and prize-fighters. She is a good worker, a good sister, and a good cook.

This insipid goddess and Sir Muscular Millionaire furnish the "romance." Let any one read "Lorna Doone," and after it "The Definite Object," and say whether Mr. Farnol's work is anything but the shabbiest, cheapest counterfeit of real romance. Lorna Doone, like Hermione, is sweet and kind and modest and fair to behold, but what a gulf between them! And between John Ridd, Lorna's man of might, and Ravenslee, who can describe the yawning chasm? Since Blackmore's day, romance has been crowded out of sight by the weight of realistic (eheu!) writers, and since Stevenson's brief resuscitation of the romantic spirit, we have had no descendants of Scott. What shall we say of this touching love scene between the goddess and the Man?

"Hermione, in all this big world there is only one person I want. Could you ever learn to love a peanut man?"

"That would all depend," she answered softly.

"Because," he continued gently, "because I love you, Hermione!"

"Love me!" she repeated, shaking her head. "Ah, no, no—your world is not my world nor ever could be."

"Why, then, your world shall be mine," said he, drawing a pace nearer. As he spoke he reached out very suddenly, and clasping her slender hands, stooped and kissed them reverently. Now, glancing up, he beheld her red lips quivering while her eyes were suffused all at once, as, drooping her head, she strove to loose his hold.

"Let me go!" she whispered, "I— I— ah, let me go!"

"Hermione," he breathed, "oh, Hermione, how beautiful you are!" But at this she cried out almost as if he had struck her and, wrenching her hands free, covered her face.

"Oh, God!—are all men the same?"

This dialogue is typical. Perhaps nine tenths of the story is told in dialogue, interspersed by "she whispered," "she said, tender-voiced," "said he, his voice as placid," "she nodded," "she sighed," "said she, her red mouth all tender curves," "said she, softly," and the like *ad infinitum, ad nauseam, ad delirium*.

What has been called the "romance" of Mr. Farnol's work turns out, on closer observation, to be mere sensuality. Take, for example, the chapter "Concerning Ankles, Stairs, and Neighbourliness," which tells of the meeting of hero and heroine.

Geoffrey Ravenslee began to climb the many stairs that led up to his new abode. All at once, he became aware of one who climbed half a flight above him, and glancing up, he saw a foot in a somewhat worn shoe, a shapely foot nevertheless, joined to a slender ankle which peeped and vanished alternately beneath a neat, well-brushed skirt that swayed to the vigorous action of the shapely limbs it covered. He was yet observing the soft, rounded curves of this most feminine back when he became aware of two facts: one, that she bore a heavy suit case in her neatly gloved hand; two, that the tress of hair peeping rebellious (*sic*) beneath the neat hat brim was of a wondrous yellow gold. Instantly he hastened his steps, and reaching out his hand almost instinctively, sought to relieve her of her burden.

"Allow me!" said he.

She stopped, and looked down on him with a pair of wondering blue eyes; her cheeks glowed. And looking up into the flushed loveliness of her face, those eyes deep and soft beneath their long black lashes, the tender droop of those vivid lips, beholding all this, he knew her to be a thousand times more beautiful than any photograph could possibly portray (!), wherefore he bared his head, and striving to speak, could find no words to utter.

When I call this cheap and sensual, I am not merely objecting to the fact that the words used by the characters in the talk that ensues are simple or common, or that our attention is called in this first glance at Hermione to such things as "vivid lips," "blue eyes deep and soft," "long black lashes," "glowing cheeks," "shapely feet," "slender ankles," and "shapely limbs." Let me but here append the account of another first meeting, in which feet and lips and eyes and hair all again appear. The chance meeting, the offer of physical assistance, all are the same, but with what a difference! It should not need a Hamlet to point it out.

Look here, upon this picture, and on this.
Have you eyes?
Could you on this fair mountain leave to feed,
And batten on this moor? Ha! have you eyes?
What judgment
Would step from this to this?
O shame! where is thy blush?

I quote from George Meredith's "Richard Feverel":

Somewhere at the founts of the world lay the land Richard was rowing towards. It was not a dream, he knew. There was a secret abroad. The woods were full of it.

Meadow-sweet hung from the banks thick with weed and trailing bramble, and there also hung a daughter of earth. Her face was shaded by a broad straw-hat with a flexible brim that left her lips and chin in the sun. On a closer inspection you might see that her lips were stained. This blooming young person was regaling on dewberries. They grew between the bank and the water. A boat slipped towards her, containing a dreamy youth, and still she plucked the fruit, and ate, and mused, as if no fairy prince were in-

vading her territories, and as if she wished not for one, or knew not her wishes. Just then one enticing dewberry caught her eyes. He was floating by unheeded, and saw that her hand stretched low, and could not gather what it sought. A stroke from his right brought him beside her. The damsel glanced up dismayed, and her whole shape trembled over the brink. Richard sprang from his boat into the water. Pressing a hand beneath her foot, which she had thrust against the crumbling wet sides of the bank to save herself, he enabled her to recover her balance, and gain safe earth, whither, emboldened by the incident, touching her finger's tip, he followed her.

Now, lovers of Farnol, give ear!

The world lay wrecked behind him. . . . Hark, how Ariel sung overhead! . . . And, O you Wonder! . . . Radiant Miranda! Prince Ferdinand is at your feet.

The youth looked on her with as glowing an eye. And she—mankind was all Caliban to her, saving this one princely youth.

So to each other said their changing eyes, and the Miranda spoke, and they came down to earth, feeling no less in heaven.

She spoke to thank him for his aid. She used quite common simple words; but to him she was uttering magic, casting spells, and the effect they had on him was manifested in the incoherence of his replies, which were too foolish to be chronicled. . . .

They walked silently across the meadow. "You really must not come any farther," she softly said.

"And will you go, and not tell me who you are?" he asked. "What is your name?" said his mouth, while his eyes added, "O wonderful creature! How came you to enrich the earth?"

"I must go," she said, and with a soft word of farewell, passed across the stile. And away with her went the wild enchantment: he looked on barren air.

Or let us compare the way in which Mr. Farnol describes the first kiss and George Meredith's description of the same event.

"But," she whispered, "I am only—"

"The best, the noblest I have ever known."

"But a— scrubwoman!"

"With dimples in her elbows, Hermione!" In one stride he was beside her.

"Dear," he said, leaning toward her, "from the very first I've been dying to have you in my arms, but now I— I dare not touch you unless you— will it so. Let me have my answer— look up, Hermione!"

Slowly she obeyed, and beholding the shy languor of her eyes, the sweet hurry of her breathing, and all the sighing, trembling loveliness of her, he set his arms about her, drawing her close; and she, yielding to those compelling arms, gave herself to the passion of his embrace. And so he kissed her, her warm, soft-quivering mouth, her eyes, her silken hair, until she sighed and struggled in his clasp.

Could a scrubwoman anatomize a sacred kiss more coarsely than this? Now for Meredith's version:

The prince and princess of the island meet; here like darkling nightingales they sit, and into eyes and ears and hands pour endless ever-fresh treasures of their souls. He calls her by her name, Lucy: and she, blushing at her great boldness, has called him by his, Richard.

"My own! my own for ever! You are pledged to me? Whisper!"

He hears the delicious music.

"And you are mine?"

A soft beam travels to the fern-covert under the pine-wood where they sit, and for answer he has her eyes: turned to him an instant, timidly fluttering over the depths of his, and then downcast. Their lips are locked.

Pipe no more, Love, for a time! Pipe as you will you cannot express their first kiss; nothing of its sweetness, and of the sacredness of it nothing. St. Cecilia up aloft, before the silver organ-pipes of Paradise, pressing fingers upon all the notes of which Love is but one, from her you may hear it. So Love is silent.

How Farnol gloats over his embraces! How he magnifies the coarse details, like a moving-picture "close-up!"

Hermione reached up her arms, sudden, passionate arms; so they stood thus, heart beating to heart, until, lifting her head, she gave her lips to his. . . .

He kissed her until she sighed and stirred in his embrace. . . .

She felt herself swung up and up and so lay crushed and submissive in his fierce embrace. So he stooped and kissed her hair, her glowing cheek, her soft white neck.

In the volume by Professor Sherman referred to above, there is found a chapter on "Shakespeare, Our Contemporary." In explanation, the author says, "Shakespeare is here because I find him the most interesting and suggestive of living writers. His presence helps one to distinguish the values of his competitors." Compare the sophisticated remarks just quoted with any of Shakespeare's love scenes and the difference is startling. Has Mr. Farnol ever heard Juliet say:

Dost thou love me? I know thou wilt say 'Ay';
And I will take thy word;
O gentle Romeo!
If thou dost love, pronounce it faithfully.

And when Florizel speaks:

What you do
Still betters what is done. When you speak, sweet,
I'd have you do it ever: when you sing,
I'd have you buy and sell so; so give alms;
Pray so; and, for the ordering your affairs,
To sing them too: when you do dance, I wish you
A wave o' the sea, that you might ever do
Nothing but that; move still, still so,
And own no other function,

what need of stage directions relating to Perdita's "glowing cheek" or "soft-quivering mouth?" And when Miranda offers her love to Ferdinand:

Mir. Do you love me?
Fer. O heaven! O earth! bear witness to this sound,
If I speak true:

I

Beyond all limit of what else i' the world,
Do love, prize, honor you. . . .

Mir. I am your wife, if you will marry me;
If not, I'll die your maid: I'll be your servant
Whether you will or no,

there is no one who wishes to be told that he kisses her "hair, her glowing cheek, her soft white neck."

And, as a fitting climax to such grossness, pandering old Mrs. Trapes draws the curtains in this way:

"Well," said Mrs. Trapes, "I guess she's in bed somewhere. If I was you, I'd go an' look—till I found her—"

"Mrs. Trapes," said he, "I will!"

"Find her?" mused Mrs. Trapes. "Why, I guess he will sure find her—where she should have been weeks ago. Lord, what a silly, beautiful, lovely thing love is!"

Then she sighed, switched off the lights, and went softly away.

In striking contrast with this worldly scene, I add without comment an excerpt from the final chapter of "Vanity Fair":

What took place was briefly this:

A lady in a dripping white bonnet and shawl, with her two little hands out before her, went up to Dobbin, and in the next minute she had altogether disappeared under the folds of the old cloak, was kissing one of his hands with all her might; whilst the other, I suppose, was engaged in holding her to his heart (which her head just about reached) and in preventing her from tumbling down. She was murmuring something about—forgive—dear William—dear, dear, dearest friend—kiss, kiss, kiss, and so forth—and in fact went on under the cloak in an absurd manner.

When Emmy emerged from it, she still kept tight hold of one of William's hands and looked up in his face. It was full of sadness and tender love and pity. She understood its reproach, and hung down her head.

"It was time you sent for me, dear Amelia," he said.

"You will never go again, William."

"No, never," he answered, and pressed the dear little soul once more to his heart.

In order to make certain that no one will confuse his hero or heroine with any of the other characters in the story, Mr. Farnol has hit upon a novel idea. These two are the only characters who know, or who can make use of, good grammar. Every one else speaks a curious jargon.

The rule which the author seems to have followed in his

character-factory is: select some one topic, or phrase, or idea for each separate character, and have him refer to this topic, or mention this phrase, or introduce this idea, every time he appears on the stage. Simplicity itself!

So, in writing "The Definite Object," one can picture the diagram hung up over the author's desk. It must have been something like this:

Brimberly: drops all h's, and says "hobject," "haristocrat," etc.; his whiskers vibrate, bristle, quiver, or twitch, according to the requirements of the scene.

Joe, the Chauffeur: says "crickey" and "crumbs" whenever convenient and at other times; calls the Old Un such names as "bones," or "bag-o'-bones," "old viciousness," "old tombstones," "old rasper," "old skin-and-bones," "old vagabond," "old bag of iniquity," and the like, to cover up his affection for the old man.

Spike: says "guy" as often as possible; at times uses the word twice in one sentence, and in especially elevated passages three or even four times in a single speech. Though his name is Chesterton, he rivals Italian Tony in substituting "d" for "th."

Mrs. Trapes: enters with a toasting-fork; always asks "What'll you have for breakfast, or dinner, or supper, as the case may be? How about—" here she may choose from the following assortment, not using more than one phrase in any one scene:

a nice English mutton
chop wiv tomatoes
a lovely piece of liver, nice and hot
thick gravy an' a tater or so
sassiges
a chop, cut thick, an' with a kidney in it
a couple o' fresh eggs an' a lovely ham
rasher
chicken fricassee (correctly pronounced)
sparrerrgrass (to add variety to the pronunciation)

water cress an' angel cake an' a pot o'
strawberry jam
b'iled salmon an' green peas.

In addition, emphasizes the fact that "love is a wonderful thing" by constant iteration.

Tony: uses "d" for "th," and adds "a" to every other word; speaks of signorinas, and Pietro; knows everything that the "roughnecks" are planning to do.

The Old Un: is extremely fond of tea—afternoon tea—in New York, and likes jam with it; likes very much to say the following picturesque expressions: lumme, dang ye, gorramighty, lor lumme, lor' gorramighty, and other varieties.

Soapy: always enters with a cigarette; make constant reference to "pallor" or "wild glare of his eyes."

In addition to these useful mechanical devices, the author has the added advantage of having lived in both London and New York. When he wrote, "Very soon he came to a small drug-store," and mentioned "the taps and knobs of the soda-fountain" inside, Mr. Farnol no doubt patted himself on the back for having learned that barbarous American word "drug-store," forgetting apparently, however, that a drug-store is run by a druggist. For when Ravenslee asks for the use of the telephone, "'Right there,' said the chemist!"

Of course, one must admit, this mixture of Americanism and Angloism has this advantage: at least half of it can be understood on either side of the ocean. So, when the Princess Somebody, alias Hazel Bowker, is dreaming of a New York children's paradise, she is made to speak of "ices," and "cream sodas." Though "ice" does not seem to be at all ambiguous in England, Mr. Farnol seems to have spent his eight years in New York without learning that *we* (including New York children) say "ice cream" and likewise "ice cream sodas."

To be perfectly fair to Mr. Farnol, it is necessary to add a word or two of favorable comment. His novels are un-

doubtedly carefully written. The gratuitous incidents of Compton Mackenzie, the prosaic details of Arnold Bennett, the struggle for cleverness of Leonard Merrick, the interminable ramblings of H. G. Wells, are all lacking. Like Hardy, Farnol has learned to concentrate his action, so as to make almost every incident, even the apparently unimportant ones, count. The unity of his plots is rigidly preserved, and there are none of Joseph Conrad's chronological labyrinths.

In addition, Mr. Farnol has a stock of humorous incidents which he is able to draw on. There is nothing very remarkable, very novel, or very unexpected, in his humor; but it helps avoid monotony and serves to fill out the intervals between embracings and osculations.

Mr. Farnol has made a very careful study of New York slang and has reproduced it about as well as one could expect from an Englishman—certainly much better than any American attempt that I know of to report the dialogue of Londoners. But all the characters except the fist-fighting millionaire and the vivid-lipped, shapely-limbed bride talk slang all the time; these two never. Neither practice is true to life.

There is nothing stimulating in Mr. Farnol's work, nothing (if I may quote the words on the Wordsworth memorial tablet in the Grasmere church) "to lift up the heart to holy things." His intellectual food is hard to uncover (I had almost said "does not exist," but I think he does give us one quotation—of two words—from Virgil!) His food is neither spiritual ambrosia, nor sustaining bread and butter. Perhaps, however, he makes no pretense at being any other than his hero, Ravenslee, a peanut man.

ANNAPOLIS, MD.

VI

THE JAPANESE IN KOREA

GEORGE W. GILMORE

"Poor things, perhaps, Sirs, but—mine own!" As a reply to the article entitled, "Japan as a World Power and Relations with the United States," in the October number of the REVIEW a Korean might use these words in respect to the independence, nationality, culture, and deserts of his people. The writer of the article does not seem to appreciate either the Japanese character or the intolerance mounting to more than savagery of Japanese rule over subject peoples. He ignores the demonstrated loathsomeness of method, and is silent concerning the brutality, of Japanese rule in Korea. He is equally wide of the facts regarding Korean character and capabilities. Concerning the first part of the article, dealing with pronouncements of Japanese notables apropos of Christianity and the Sunday School convention I have little to say, except—if those expressions are sincere, why are those notables not Christian? (The utter hypocrisy of one of them I will demonstrate from his own pen.) Why do they say these things to visitors in Japan and support a policy of their government in Korea definitely aimed at the extinction of Christianity there and of Christians, even to the wholesale massacre of whole Christian villages?

The first thing to note is that for 4,000 years, as the Koreans claim, certainly for over 2,000 as demonstrated from historical documents, Koreans have developed their own nationality, independence, and culture in language and literature. These are distinct from those of their neighbors

on either hand; though from the Chinese (never from the Japanese, who have been their pupils) they have borrowed elements, such as Confucianism and Buddhism in ethics and religion, and certain principles and instruments in music. Korean nationality is as distinct from that of their neighbors as the German from the French. On these grounds they are entitled as a people and a nation to endure.

The second thing to note is that for the 2,000 years I have called historical the peninsula has been the scene of recurring robber raids and campaigns by the corsairs, freebooters, and armies of Japan. The last of these campaigns, prior to the events of 1904 and 1910, was under Hideyoshi, and lasted from 1592 to 1599. In that invasion and occupation nearly three million Koreans were killed, and the invader was driven out only by the help of China. Before he left every Korean artist and artisan was deported and every discoverable object of art was carried to Japan. From that time dates the "renaissance" of Japanese art—a product of wholesale brigandage—and the dearth of Korean creative ability. If, as Japanese claim and the article implies, Korean civilization is at a low ebb, where lies the blame? In greatest part, certainly at the door of Japanese savagery. and brigandage. Japanese geographical propinquity has ever been the curse of Korea, as it is today! Thus through two thousand years the Japanese have built up a heritage of hate which is literally insuperable; it mounts higher, as its roots are deeper, than Irish hate for England. The two races are fundamentally antagonistic, utterly irreconcilable. The Korean may perish to a man if the civilized world in this twentieth century permits the unspeakable atrocity—as it permitted the Armenian horror—but they will not become Japanese. There will be an abiding and bitter Korean question till the last Korean is crucified or beaten to death or—until Japan is driven from the peninsula or withdraws.

So much for the distant background of the present situation. How did the present status come about?

It is the result of a combination of militaristic imperialism, unholy ambition for dominion like that of Germany, and a brazen perfidy, hypocrisy, and lying such as make Turk and Teuton seem almost mild offenders. In the light of recent and current history, a Japanese pledge has no value except that of a counterfeit.

The present situation was forevisaged by Japan in the treaty forced on Korea in 1876, when the Japanese demanded and received extraterritorial privileges for such of her nationals as should go to Korea. The war with China was even then indicated, since China's interest in Korea stood in the way of Japan's intended absorption of the country. In 1895 Japan and China recognized "the full and complete autonomy . . . of Korea." This act Japan followed up the same year—thus! The Korean queen was a keen and shrewd patriot, who had fathomed the designs of Japan and was in the way. So Viscount Miura, the Japanese minister, had the queen hacked to pieces in the palace by his own right-hand man Okamoto, while the "legation guards" surrounded the palace. But foreign condemnation was so outspoken that for a time Japan dared go no further. In 1898 Japan with Russia again recognized the entire sovereignty of Korea. In 1902 the Anglo-Japanese alliance did the same, both parties pledging themselves against interference with Korea. Again in 1904 Japan, twice before the end of February, guaranteed Korean integrity and independence, making a treaty of alliance against Russia, receiving the use of Korean territory for the Russian campaign, and promising to remove her armies when that campaign came to an end. In 1905, Russia's case being settled by the war, Japan refused to withdraw her forces and used them to compel a protectorate. In 1907 she set aside the emperor, and in 1910 declared the annexation of the peninsula. At neither time did our respective presidents, nor the secretaries of state (Messrs. Root and Knox), do

anything but further Japan's designs, though we were pledged by treaty to use our good offices in behalf of the once Hermit Nation! This is our shame! As Henry Chung points out, the case of Japan in 1905 would have been paralleled if in December of 1918

"The American Expeditionary forces, after driving the Germans out of French territory, (had) seized France as the prize of victory."

This is the story in barest outline (with the long roll of blackest incidents left folded) of the subjection of Korea, an ally in arms, by her own ally! The unspeakable methods employed and since systematized, many of them unprintable in their shamelessness, outdid in brazenness and atrocity anything ever conceived by a nation claiming to be civilized.

→ I take up next the "regeneration of the unhappy kingdom" (the writer's phrase) by Japan after its absorption into the empire. How is Japan "regenerating" Korea? Whatever be the effect of the Mikado's rule in his own island country, in Korea it is one of brutal assault upon property, person, and culture, a deliberate policy of assault, wholesale pillage, arson, murder, and massacre. And beyond this is the settled policy of debauching body and mind of subject peoples, the former by the introduction of opium where it was never before used, the latter by the wholesale and retail introduction of prostitution with all its dread sequelæ, to the point of leading bands of licensed prostitutes like barnstorming players into remote villages where the like had never before been seen. The attack is upon the physical, moral, and spiritual, to the definite end of eliminating opposition by determined sapping of vital structures.

Still further is the insidious attack upon Christianity, restricting the curriculums of schools and colleges established and maintained by missionary agencies; browbeating and threatening, arresting and degrading, Christian missiona-

ries—for example by putting on them articles of Korean wear signifying criminality;—falsely charging them with abetting and inciting revolt against Japanese rule, and imposing insulting restrictions upon even their private life and entertainment of guests. Besides all this is the treatment of Christian natives—arrest on mere suspicion with beating in numerous cases even to death, long imprisonment without trial, torture of most brutal ingenuity; tearing the clothing from modest Christian maidens and driving them nude through snowy streets to unheated prisons, stopping for beatings on the way; burning whole villages of Koreans not only in Korea but in China, after sending armies into the territory of a friendly neighbor for this express purpose; ordering the population of a place into a gendarme compound and shooting them down from the top of the wall; enclosing an entire valley and shooting the inhabitants as they attempted to escape to the surrounding hills; at Chai-ammi-ni shutting the Christians of the place in the church, shooting them there, and then firing the church; setting fire to the houses of villages (as at Suchon) and shooting the dwellers as they came out! In 1905 the Koreans in despair by thousands cried: Our only hope is in the Jesus religion. This refuge pagan Japan declares—by acts such as those named above, repeated in many places, and each specifiable by place and time so as to leave no chink where doubt may linger—shall be refused to them.

And this is what is meant by “regenerating the unhappy kingdom!” God save the mark! It is hard enough for Koreans to suffer the physical, mental, and spiritual torture that is theirs in their indeed “unhappy” land under the monstrous rule of the Japanese! But to have a Christian minister return from Japan with praise for their persecutors, complacency for their sufferings, and unmerited contempt for their heroic nation must be like acid in their wounds. And these are the Christians and this the land where, ac-

cording to the testimony of missionaries and visitors alike, there is a closer approach to the fervor and whole-hearted dedication which characterized the Apostolic Church than has been manifested in any other modern mission field!

Just one thing more. The article cites a number of notables as speaking in favor of Christianity, among them Baron Sakatani as follows:

"I am not a Christian yet, but I do not hesitate to call your religion the world religion; not a national or a state religion. Now we, the people of the whole world, regardless of race or religion, must rejoice in the appearance of the world religion."

Now hear this same Sakatani in *The Advocate of Peace* for October, 1921, p. 337:

"The Korean question dates from the spring of 1919, when American missionaries, together with malcontent Koreans, charged the Japanese government with cruelty and ruthlessness in quelling the disturbances," etc.

It would be difficult to construct a sentence in so few words with so monstrous and so many lies, explicit and implicit, as this one contains. First, "the Korean question dates" not "from the spring of 1919," but back of that to the crime against humanity of 1910, behind that to the perfidy of 1905; back of that to the savage murder of the queen in 1895, still further back to the attempt of 1876; and still behind that to the hideous campaign of 1592-1597 and the long series of aggressions hinted at above. Second, the closing sentence is meant to imply the innocence of the Japanese government of the series of devilish cruelties that has marked their rule in Korea, established proof of which exists by reams in the archives of our State Department, in the files of our missionary societies, in the ashes on the sites, in the graves of the thousands of murdered, and in the prisons crowded to suffocation (literally) with helpless Korean victims of Japanese savagery. Third, in the middle

clause comes the same anti-Christian resolve—"American missionaries," etc. "American missionaries!" It is always "the missionaries" against whom lying propagandists like Sakatani and the Japanese government officials point their charges in their anti-Christian policy. Certainly Baron Sakatani is not "yet" a Christian! Not one of the men quoted in the article but can be cited expressly in terms fully as false, quite as contradictory to the tenor of these suave hypocrisies, and even to a more intensely anti-Christian purport than Sakatani. Such are the men upon whom the writer relies to show the innocence of Japanese!

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Editorial Note. The REVIEW does not ordinarily print "replies" to articles that have appeared in its pages. It is closed to controversies. But it is open, always, to constructive statements of divergent points of view. The article by Geo. W. Gilmore, Editor of the *Homiletic Review*, is printed because, though technically a reply to a previous article by Dr. R. W. Miller (*THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW*, Oct., 1921, pp. 297-322), it represents a series of facts that have an important bearing on the topic. The Managing Editors express the conviction that each of these complementary articles ably represents an exclusive point of view, and, therefore, fails to do full justice to the intricate question of the Japanese in Korea. Readers may be referred to the discriminating and balanced presentation of this problem in the March number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, in an article entitled, *The Policy of Japan in Korea*.

THE MANAGING EDITORS.

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

RECENT BOOKS ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

- The New Program of Religious Education.* By George Herbert Betts. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 107. Price, 75 cents.
- Organization and Administration of Religious Education.* By John Elbert Stout. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 287. Price, \$1.50.
- The Meaning of Education.* By James H. Snowden. The Abingdon Press. Pp. 122. Price, 75 cents.
- The Child. Its Relation to God and the Church.* By Carl F. Eltzholtz. The Methodist Book Concern, New York. Pp. 56. Price, 50 cents.
- Student's History of the Hebrews.* By Laura A. Knott. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 413.
- Hebrew Life and Times.* By Harold B. Hunting. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 188. Price, \$1.25.
- The Life and Times of Jesus. Teacher's Manual.* By Frederick C. Grant. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 164. Price, \$1.00.
- The Bible in Graded Story.* Two volumes by Clara Belle Baker and Edna Dean Baker. Volume One: *The Good Shepherd.* Pp. 83. Price, 75 cents. Volume Two: *The Good Neighbor.* Pp. 136. Price, \$1.00. The Abingdon Press, New York.
- Shorter Bible Plays.* By Rita Benton. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 135. Price, \$1.25.
- Pageantry and Dramatics in Religious Education.* By William V. Meredith. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 212. Price, \$1.25.
- A Travel Book for Juniors.* By Helen Patten Hanson. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 258. Price, \$1.25.
- Followers of the Marked Trail.* By Nannie Lee Frayser. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 232. Price, \$1.25.
- The American Home Series.* Norman E. Richardson, Editor. The Abingdon Press, New York.
- The Mother-Teacher of Religion.* By Anna Freelove Betts. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 290. Price, \$2.00.
- Sunday Talks to Teachers.* By Helen Wodehouse. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 126. Price, \$1.25.
- The Modern Reader's Abridged Bible for Schools.* Old Testament. Edited by R. G. Moulton. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 536. Price, \$2.50.

One of the most significant signs of our time is the new emphasis on Religious Education. It is quite unprecedented in the history of organized Christianity, both in its wisdom and volume. To be sure, there have always been "educational churches," so-called, whose main reliance for propagating the faith was upon catechetical instruction. Their fundamental principles were soundly Christian. They affirmed that all children (at least all that are born into Christian families) belong to God, and that the Church must teach them to appropriate their heritage through catechization and by confirmation. They stressed the "conservation of children," rather than the "reclamation of adults." They were pioneers and pathfinders, richly meriting the appreciation of all who follow after them.

But our appreciation of their labors does not make us blind to the defects of their methods. We share their faith that all children, everywhere, belong to God, and their zeal for bringing them into a personal and vital fellowship with their Father. But we cannot imitate their example. Their textbooks do not express our Christian convictions adequately, and their methods do not achieve our educational aims efficiently. Religious Education today does not mean "indoctrination," but imparting to the growing child, from infancy to maturity, such teaching and training in religion as will enable it to acquire sound knowledge of God, personal piety, and a godly character.

It is evident that, so conceived, Religious Education presents a problem whose solution requires the earnest labors of many men; and a program whose realization demands the intelligent coöperation of many groups. We need courses and classes for teacher-training. We need books that set forth, simply and clearly, the new aims and principles of education; that show the direct bearing on the religious training of children of psychology and pedagogy. We must have graded lessons covering many topics and adapted to different ages; and advanced courses for adoles-

cents and adults. And, on the practical side, we must arouse the interest and enlist the help of pastors and consistories, of congregations and denominations. The home, the Church, and even the State, must unite in the endeavor to impregnate the lives of children with the spirit and principles of the Christian religion.

Such a miracle is not wrought in a day, nor achieved in a generation. We are still far from the goal. But the important thing is that we see the goal and are on our way to it. The significant fact is that in all our great denominations the paramount importance of the educational task is clearly seen and emphatically stressed. The Methodist Church, *e.g.*, with its evangelistic traditions, is one of the leaders in modern Religious Education. Their Abingdon Press is publishing series of texts and many single volumes that are invaluable for teachers and students. Our Reformed Church should rapidly take its place in the forefront of this great enterprise. That is where we belong, by tradition and training.

The books listed above are representative volumes, one and all. They vary in excellence, in scope and purpose, but not in spirit and aim. Some are general treatises on Religious Education, while others are textbooks designed to meet the needs of specific grades and groups. But all are modern in their approach, scientific in method, and profoundly religious in spirit. They are an effective reply to the foolish jibe that modern Religious Education forgets that religion cannot be taught; that it concerns the heart and not the head. They are noble helps for quickening and deepening the life of God in the souls of men. They place at our disposal the treasures of psychology and the riches of pedagogy for the training of our children to Christian manhood and womanhood, and for teaching them to understand the Gospel of Christ.

The New Program of Religious Education is a most suggestive book. George Herbert Betts, its author, is Professor

of Religious Education in the University of Southern California. He is also the Associate Editor of the Abingdon Religious Education Texts. Compact in form, inexpensive, thoroughly competent both in its critical and constructive treatment, the volume forms a very valuable primer in Religious Education. It fairly throbs with the conviction that the primary obligation of the Church is to devise and maintain an adequate system of religious education. It is difficult to see how any sane Christian man, following his argument, can escape his conclusions. The book also contains many stimulating suggestions concerning the constructive program to be followed in the congregation.

Organization and Administration of Religious Education is placed next in our list because, in logical sequence, it should be read after the introductory treatise written by Prof. Betts. These two volumes together contain a fine survey of the meaning and method of religious education. Novices can do no better than to acquire an acquaintance with the subject through the portals of these two books. The author of this second volume is Professor of Administration in Religious Education in Northwestern University. He applies the science of school administration, as it obtains in colleges and public schools, to the problem of religious education. No phase of the many-sided task seems to have been omitted. Introductory chapters deal with The Educational Function of the Church, The Aims of Religious Education and A Program of Religious Education. But the distinctive contributions of the book are made in chapters V to XII, which contain the experienced wisdom of a school administrator. Without such expert advice and assistance, the training of teachers, the administrative management of pupils, and the organization of Church Schools in the community or in congregations, will lack the elements that make for strength and permanence. A list of selected books is appended to this volume.

Two other books of our list are of a general nature. The

first, *The Meaning of Education*, is from the pen of Prof. James H. Snowden. It deals with education in general. Beginning with the body, as the physical basis of life, and ranging through the intellect, the sensibilities, the will, the process reaches its culmination in the spirit of man. The author presents the hidden psychology of education in language intelligible to all. Though brief in its treatment, the book is full of light. Placed in the hands of youths, it will show them a noble goal, worth striving for and attainable by all. *The Child. Its Relation to God and the Church*, is a plea by a Methodist to Methodists for Religious Education.

All the other books in our list, save the two mentioned last, are textbooks and manuals for teachers dealing with various topics. Some bear familiar titles, like *Student's History of the Hebrews* and *The Life and Times of Jesus*. Others come with strange labels, like *Pageantry and Dramatics in Religious Education* and *Followers of the Marked Trail*. But even the familiar titles contain happy surprises. Thus, e.g., in her *Student's History of the Hebrews*, Laura A. Knott essays an ancient task. But she achieves such admirable results that the reviewer desires earnestly that some discerning Maecenas might place a copy of it into the hands of every adult or adolescent studying the International Sunday School Lessons for the current year. It would make the Old Testament more intelligible to them, and no less divine. Good pictures and clear maps adorn this volume. Similar to it, in scope and spirit, is the book entitled *Hebrew Life and Times*. Both are warmly recommended for use in appropriate classes.

Pageantry and Dramatics in Religious Education blazes a new path. A few years ago such titles were unknown. Even today some men will question the propriety and wisdom of books of this nature. They seem to introduce the theatre into the Church. But these critics forget that, at one time, the theatre *was* the handmaid of religion. And

they ignore the fact that the dramatic instinct is deeply grounded in human nature, divine in its origin and of profound significance for the development of character. The author of this book discusses these themes in a scholarly and illuminating manner. His statement of the case, its historic antecedents, its psychological foundation, its practical possibilities, are the finest defense imaginable (if defense were needed), and the very best recommendation for a far more general use, of pageantry and dramatics in religious education. This book is a comprehensive treatise on the theory and practice of the religious drama. *Shorter Bible Plays*, by Rita Benton, is wholly practical. It contains ten dramatizations of biblical stories. Pastors and others, who are making their plans for Vacation Bible Schools, will find these two volumes exceedingly suggestive and useful. And that is equally true of *The Bible in Graded Story* (2 volumes). Here we have over fifty stories from the Bible, for children from six to eight. They are admirably told. They will delight and instruct children, and they will help teachers to acquire a difficult art.

The Life and Times of Jesus is a manual for teachers. Its threefold aim is to enable the teacher to impart to the pupil "correct and useful knowledge of the life of Jesus and the times in which he lived; to develop right attitudes, ideals, standards of living—the natural reaction from his contact with Jesus; and the encouragement of his desire and determination to carry over both knowledge and attitudes into practice, and make application of them in his daily life." Sunday School teachers, who lack professional training for their work, will find this book exceedingly helpful. It covers the life of Jesus from his birth to his resurrection. It points out, in each chapter, the items that require special emphasis. It contains very definite suggestions on procedure. And it sketches the application of every lesson to the life of the pupil, and the assignment of home-work. Frequent, and well-chosen, references to

collateral reading are another commendable and valuable feature. The content of this volume, as well as its arrangement and style, entitle it to a place in every well-equipped library of Religious Education.

Followers of the Marked Trail and *A Travel Book for Juniors* are similar books. Both belong to the Week-Day School Series published as a part of the Abingdon Religious Education Texts. They are intended for use in Junior classes. Each of these volumes is attractively illustrated, and contains thirty-two lessons. They form a biblical travelogue. The pupil visits the Holy Land and becomes acquainted with the places and persons of the Bible. The method pursued in these textbooks is unquestionably the right one. It brings the Bible to the level of the normal life of Juniors. It invests remote places and dim persons with reality. But in the application of this method to the varied content of the Bible, marked differences of evaluation will manifest themselves. A keen sense of proportion is required in an attempt to conduct a young pupil through the historic scenes and places of Old and New Testament history. And a thorough knowledge of the progressive development of religion, within the Bible, is needed to single out, from the host of patriarchs, prophets, kings, and priests, the truly representative men. The two volumes under review are defective because they neglect the great prophets of Israel, and because they give a wholly disproportionate place to the Old Testament. But they must be welcomed as being useful and instructive examples of a new type of textbooks.

The American Home Series consists of pamphlets relating to the vital interests of the home—to the care and culture of children. More than thirty have already appeared, covering every conceivable topic, from "Thumb-Sucking" to art, religion, and music in the home. Each pamphlet was written by a competent authority. Among the authors we note the staff of the American Institute

of Child Life, William B. Forbush, Felix Adler, George H. Betts, and others of similar competency. Parents and teachers, who are seriously facing the problems of temper, fighting, sex, etc., will find in these excellent and inexpensive pamphlets the light they need.

The reviewer's warmest and fullest meed of praise is reserved for *The Mother-Teacher of Religion*, by Anna Free-love Betts. This book is dedicated "To the Many Mothers who are trying to make God real in the Hearts and Lives of their Children." And it establishes its right to display that noble dedication on its front. No finer gift could find its way into our homes. It places the final responsibility for the child's religious nurture and guidance squarely on the parents. But it wastes no time with futile criticism of our present delinquency in this supremely important matter. It recognizes the difficulty and delicacy of the parental task, the eager desire of fathers and mothers to give the best gifts to their children, frustrated by a lack of knowledge and experience. It is this parental helplessness the volume seeks to overcome. It requires a woman to succeed in that high endeavor. One, moreover, whose intuitive insight into the soul of a child has been disciplined into ripe wisdom by much study and wide experience. Such wisdom may be found in this splendid volume, from the Mother's Creed and Prayer on the opening page to the last chapter on Keeping Close to our Children. Technical terms are scrupulously avoided. But scholars and students will find that the book is based upon sound theories of science and religion. And, unconsciously, mothers themselves will acquire a practical training in religious psychology and pedagogy while using it as a guide for the training and teaching of their children.

The table of contents comprises twenty chapters. They carry the following headings: Beginnings, The Awakening Mind, Physical Foundations, First Impressions, Teaching About God, Teaching the Child to Pray, Prayers which Children Pray, The Atmosphere of the Home, The Play-

Mother, Mother- and Father-Plays, Teaching through Pictures and Stories, Stories and Pictures for the Young Child, Picture Stories about Jesus, Stories from the Old and New Testament, Religion through Songs, Sunday in the Home, Foundations of Character, Teaching the Fundamental Virtues, Children's Problems, Keeping Close to our Children.

The volume is meant chiefly for the mother; and it has in mind the child in the pre-school age, when the home is its greatest school. Many pictures adorn its pages, among them some of the noblest treasures of art. Each chapter has lists of selected books, and a good bibliography of children's books is placed at the end.

Sunday Talks to Teachers consists of ten addresses, by Miss Helen Wodehouse, a Professor in the University of Bristol. The themes treated are not unfamiliar to the average reader. They are: Guides and Light-Bringers, The Yoke, The Good Day, God the Prisoner, Opportunities, Childishness, Powers of Darkness, Witnesses, The Strength of the Lord, The Desire for Experience. But while these subjects may not tempt jaded palates to taste of the book, their treatment and development will prove to be a tonic for the soul. The tonic is meant especially for Sunday School teachers, who are apt to lose sight of the glory of their calling in the drudgery of it; and for all workers who know moods of dejection and discouragement, when the task does no longer seem worth while. The author of these understanding addresses shows us the lustre of familiar things and the glory of humble tasks. She sends us back to our work girded with power. And that is a fine ministry. A book that helps teachers by heartening their souls deserves a wide reading.

The last book in our list deals with the Bible itself, our greatest textbook in religious education. It is *The Modern Reader's Bible for Schools*, edited by Professor Richard G. Moulton. His "Modern Reader's Bible" is well known.

It met a need that was universally felt by presenting, on the printed page, the original literary form of the Scriptures. The great significance of that service may be readily grasped if one imagines any modern book cut up into verses and cumbered with notes. In its traditional form, multitudes of men had no higher conception of the Bible than that it was an arsenal of proof-texts for defensive and offensive purposes. Professor Moulton was the first to show English readers the literary beauty and charm of the Bible, and thus to interpret its religious meaning.

The present volume is an abridged edition of the larger work. It contains only the Old Testament, and is a companion volume of the book containing the New Testament, previously issued and similarly abridged. These two books print approximately one third of the Bible text. But the omission of large sections nowhere destroys the vital continuity of the Bible. It sets its historical meaning into bolder relief and makes its religious significance plain. This abridged version, of course, is not offered as a substitute for the complete Bible. It is intended, primarily, for use in schools and colleges, and no one will doubt that the educational value of the Bible has been immeasurably enhanced by its presentation in this form. But the usefulness of the volume is not restricted to any one sphere. Its place is in the home as well as in the school. It will commend itself to all men of discriminating judgment as the very best help available for making the Bible a book that is read, loved, and understood.

THEODORE F. HERMAN.

RECENT BOOKS ON THEOLOGY.

A Student's Philosophy of Religion. By William Kelley Wright, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Dartmouth College. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 472. Price, \$3.75.

The Fundamentals of Christianity. A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and Paul. By Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History, Crozer Theological Seminary. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 250. Price, \$2.00.

- The Promise of His Coming.* An Historical Interpretation and Revolution of the Idea of the Second Advent. By Chester Charlton McCown, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature in Pacific School of Religion. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 256. Price, \$2.00.
- The New Testament Today.* By Ernest Findlay Scott, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 92. Price, \$1.00.
- Creative Christianity.* A Study of the Genius of the Christian Faith. By George Cross. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 164.
- What Christianity Means To Me.* A spiritual autobiography. By Lyman Abbott. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 194.
- The Simple Gospel.* By Rev. H. S. Brewster. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. 201. Price, \$1.50.
- Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought.* By Horace Blake Williams. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 181. Price, \$1.25.
- What Must the Church do to be Saved?* And other discussions. By Ernest Fremont Tittle. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 166. Price, \$1.25.
- Modernism and the Christian Faith.* By John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary. The Methodist Book Concern, New York. Pp. 306. Price, \$2.75.

Here is a group of weighty books dealing with theological and philosophical questions. They represent only a few choice blossoms from a tree of knowledge whose perennial bloom must astonish and confound those dull persons who tell us that theology is dead. Apparently, it was never more alive than today. The Macmillan Press alone sends out a continuous stream of theological books that are eagerly read. And many other publishing houses are catering to the same widespread demand for solid and sober books on ultimate questions. Other interests wax and wane with the passing years, but man's interest in himself and in his relation to the universe is not subject to fluctuating fashions. It is imperishable. "Popular," in the cheap sense of that term, books like those listed above will never be. But highly prized they are, by intelligent laymen as well as by technical scholars. To be sure, theology and philosophy themselves have had a new birth. Both in substance and

form they are new. And that, in large measure, explains their enlarging sphere of influence. Cast in the rigid mould of past ages, they speak in a dead language that is understood by an ever dwindling number of expert scholars. But when theology ceases to be a mummy and becomes a living thing, whether by the spoken word or on the printed page, it never lacks sympathetic hearers. For ministers, especially, weighty books on great themes are absolutely indispensable. They enrich the man and they ennoble his message. Vigorous sermons never grow in empty minds. They are the by-product of wide reading and careful thinking. And this is the time to select a few great books for summer reading.

The simplest book in the listed group is Lyman Abbott's *What Christianity Means To Me*. It is the spiritual autobiography of a modern prophet, universally known as the Editor of *The Outlook*. Many have known before what the religion of Christ means to the distinguished author. For he has not kept silent about it these many years. And their number is legion who have followed his leading into an apprehension of Christianity that satisfies heart and mind and will. But it is a fine thing, nevertheless, to receive from him this comprehensive statement of his faith. It is the crowning gift of a long and useful life. And it is needless to add that it possesses all the simplicity, clarity, and spiritual depth that mark his many writings. Nor is it necessary to commend the book to those acquainted with its author.

Two other books that will appeal to all readers alike are *The Simple Gospel*, and *The New Testament Today*. Their message requires no technical training. The former is a trenchant and luminous interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. There the author finds the heart of the message of Jesus. His purpose is to point out clearly the large currents of thought that flow through the Sermon, and to show their application to modern life. He calls his

work "little more than the elucidation of the obvious." But there are many dim eyes and dull hearts who do not see "the obvious" at all. We are grateful to the writer for setting it forth so clearly and so searchingly. In the light of his elucidation we realize how radically we must reconstruct our social order to bring it into conformity to the Spirit of the Master. The book is a distinctive addition to the literature on the Sermon on the Mount. Professor Scott's book on *The New Testament Today*, wholly different in content and purpose, is like the volume mentioned above in simplicity of style and in its perfect clearness. This volume comes from the pen of a leading New Testament scholar. It contains the result of years of critical study of the Gospels and Epistles. And that result, as stated in this delightfully instructive book, is most reassuring. We need books of this kind in the presence of much doubt and difficulty created by our critical knowledge of the genesis and growth of the literature of early Christianity. The laity needs to be assured that the real authority of the New Testament, as the source-book of our faith, is greater today, and its spiritual message clearer than ever before. Likewise ministers will find rare profit and pleasure in following the author's lucid argument to his positive and constructive conclusions. The book contains four chapters: The Right of the New Testament, The Modern Interpretation, The New Testament as a Product of its Time, The New Testament in the Modern World. They may easily be read at one sitting. But they will amply repay re-reading, or second and third time. They are closely packed with the results of careful study, without the least trace of pedantic learning.

What Must The Church Do To Be Saved? embodies the sixth series of The Mendenhall Lectures, delivered at De Pauw University. The thesis and the attitude of the book may be inferred from its striking title. The author believes that, for her salvation, the Church must clothe her message

in the living language of the present time. The salvation he has in mind is, not necessarily from extinction, but from inefficiency. Both in her thought and organization the Church is inefficient today, the writer maintains. Puerile denominationalism, selfish individualism, and static conservatism make her impotent to play a dominant rôle in the reconciliation of the nations and in the reconstruction of the social order. In these lectures we have a restatement of some of the great truths of our Christian faith, and of the mission of the Church in the world. The chapter headings are: What must the Church do to be saved?, The Changing Conception of God, Sin, Salvation, Jesus Christ the Hope of the World, Christianity and Life. The book itself is a proof that the Church has never been more eagerly alive than today; never more intent upon fulfilling her divine mission. It is heartily recommended to all whose prayers and labors are for a more efficient Church.

Two of the volumes listed above, apart from their general value, have the added merit of timeliness. They are *The Promise of His Coming* and *The Fundamentals of Christianity*. And where is the community that lacks its "pros" and "cons" on the Second Advent of Christ? Or whither shall one flee to escape the din of the Fundamentalist controversy? To the reviewer, the first book mentioned is like a calm, strong light shining into great darkness and confusion; and the second, like a sword smiting the rusty armor of dead dogmatism. And both lights and swords are much needed today.

There is a voluminous literature on the Second Advent, to which frequent additions are being made. But Professor McCown's volume duplicates no existing book and, in certain respects, surpasses all others for practical usefulness. If it cannot cure men who are caught in the meshes of fanciful interpretations of the apocalyptic writings, it will, at least, save others from that pathetic plight. And it will do that because it puts enlightenment in place of disparagement.

The author enters the field, not as a partisan, but as a peace-maker. His book is not written for scholars, but for intelligent men and women in all ranks of life. Students, indeed, will detect everywhere the wide and thorough orientation of the writer in a realm of investigation that is labyrinthine. But no technical training whatever is required to understand the book and to appreciate its sanity. And the great merit of the volume is that, instead of defending a thesis, it patiently and clearly presents evidence that enables men to form their own conclusions. There is, first, an historical survey of the origin and development of apocalyptic hopes among Hebrews, Jews, and Christians. And then, on this basis, the attempt is made to indicate the abiding spiritual significance and the permanent social meaning and message of Pre-millennialism. The book deserves strong recommendation, and the widest reading by the laity and clergy.

Professor Vedder, in his book entitled *The Fundamentals of Christianity*, wields the sword trenchantly. It may be that the party within the Baptist Church known as "Fundamentalists" will speak the final word within their own ecclesiastical councils, much as that were to be regretted, but, in any case, Doctor Vedder refuses to let them pass unchallenged as the only spokesmen of the Christian faith. Very properly he affirms, "It is a time for plain speech." And in his vigorous volume this great Baptist scholar speaks with refreshing plainness. Every chapter glows with the fire of his profound Christian convictions, but it also burns with indignation at the movement that is threatening his church with schism. In such a book one does not look for smooth diction. It is as rugged in its language as it is honest in thought and fearless in conviction.

There is no need of attempting here to give a detailed analysis of the ten chapters of this book. It is devoted to a study of the teachings of Jesus and Paul. Underlying it is the conviction that Christianity is the life of Christ (not

the teaching of Paul or the dogmas of the Church). His teachings must be the fundamentals of Christianity. One may venture to express the fervent hope that Professor Vedder's valiant testimony to the truth may awaken a resounding echo in his own church, and find its way to the troubled and perplexed heart of our times.

Two other books of this type are *Modernism And The Christian Faith* and *Fundamentals of Faith in the Light of Modern Thought*. They differ in size and substance, but they breathe the same spirit. The larger volume, named first, contains eleven scholarly essays on theological topics, together with many critical notes collected in an appendix. In these essays Professor Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary, frankly faces some of the difficulties of the traditional doctrines of the Church. His position is that of conservative liberalism, and his method is thoroughly constructive. Some of the issues raised are Authority, Inspiration, Miracle, Atonement, Trinity, Hell, Ritschl, Jesus. The other volume contains similar essays from the pen of a busy preacher. They are less technical and more directly practical, but they move in the same sphere of freedom of thought and firmness of faith. The value of books like these must not be sought in their definitive teachings. Theology is not a closed system. It does not claim, nor covet, fixity and finality in its statements. The worth of theological treatises is determined, primarily, by the spirit that pervades them, by their outlook upon the truths of the Christian religion. Thus evaluated, the books under review deserve a place on our shelves and a welcome in our hearts, because both view theology as an enlarging science, whose healthy growth requires the devoted labor of many men and various minds.

A Student's Philosophy of Religion combines in one volume the history, the psychology, and the philosophy of religion. The purpose of the book is "to furnish college undergraduates and general readers with the necessary

data—facts and arguments—on which they will be able to work out their own philosophy of religion." That purpose alone justifies the large undertaking. Ordinarily, each of the three separate aspects of religion would tax the resources of a specialist and crowd the covers of a book. And no one man is qualified to speak with authority on all of them. But for the purpose designated we need a guide-book in which the main provinces of human experience are delimited, and where the great precincts of thought and the main highways of speculation are clearly marked. Such a book Professor Wright, late of Cornell and now Assistant Professor of Philosophy in Dartmouth College, has given us. He has put every teacher and student of the philosophy of religion under vast obligations.

His book is an outgrowth of lecture courses which were heard by Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, by atheists and agnostics. They will now be read by a wider audience, comprising the same constituent factors. And on the basis of the facts and arguments here presented, drawn from history, psychology, and philosophy, and stated objectively, without personal bias and with scientific concreteness, intelligent readers of all classes will gain a new insight into the meaning of religion, and a new sense of its value.

But the greatest sphere of the book's usefulness lies still within the college. There it is, at present, without a peer. There are philosophies, histories, and psychologies of religion galore. Many of them possess great merit. But none of them lends itself efficiently to the specific needs of undergraduates. They are too difficult and too much restricted in their scope. Professor Wright's book will be eagerly welcomed by many teachers who enter sympathetically into the heart-searching difficulties and doubts of the modern college-man. It will prove a boon to the student whose faith is being tested and tried in the conflict of modern ideals and in the clash between science and religion. But whether in the college or outside, whether in

a teacher's chair or in the student's seat, no man can afford to neglect this significant treatise who feels the need of working out for himself a philosophy of religion. Very modestly and sparingly the author states his own opinions. Nowhere does he thrust them upon the reader dogmatically. Rather, he reports facts of history and psychology, and he states arguments based on these facts. And thus he assists us to form our own conclusions. Apart from its objective significance, one cannot easily imagine a finer mental discipline for the average man than a careful perusal of this book. It does not exceed his capacity, but it demands the concentrated energy of his mind, with its corresponding rewards.

Creative Christianity bears the sub-title *A Study of the Genius of the Christian Faith*. The book contains the Taylor lectures delivered at the Convocation of the Divinity School of Yale University, in 1921, by Professor George Cross of Rochester Seminary. The four successive chapters of this volume are headed as follows: The Method of the Study, The Discovery of the Perfect Personality, The Making of the Better World, and The Power of Cosmic Interpretation. The general title, "Creative Christianity," was chosen by the author to set forth a distinguishing quality of the faith which Jesus Christ has given to the world, viz., its creative power. The book traces this continuous self-perpetuation and progressive reincarnation of Christianity through the ages of its history. It manifests itself in many spheres, in doctrine, polity, cultus, and conduct. Our own age, too, must reconstruct the forms of its inherited faith in order to express its eternal truth. The author points out clearly the two chief impediments to the realization of this higher faith, viz., sacramentalism and legalism. These husks must be firmly repudiated in the interest of the universal propagation of Christianity. The book will be read with pleasure and profit.

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.

The publication of the twelfth volume of Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* marks the successful completion of this gigantic undertaking. It is a literary event whose epochal significance is universally recognized and ungrudgingly acknowledged. The name of James Hastings, the editor, is most honorably associated with various works of an encyclopedic character. His *Dictionaries* are a necessary part of every student's equipment. But this *Encyclopaedia* is the crowning achievement of his scholarly labor. It is one of the monumental works of scholarship. The publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons, no less than the editor and his numerous assistants, deserve the gratitude of mankind for the far-sighted vision that planned this work and for the uniform excellency that marked its separate volumes. They also deserve the amplest support of private and public purses. As a matter of course, the *Encyclopaedia* will be placed on the shelves of every public and college library in all civilized lands, for it has no equal in any land or language. But it ought also to find its way into the library of every minister. Without it, none will be complete. And congregations or consistories could well afford to present a set of this work to their pastors. Even as an investment it would be worth while, because it would enrich the man and his whole ministry. But the *Encyclopaedia* is well within reach of even slender purses. Less than twenty cents a day will pay for it. It will take the place of many separate volumes, and one may safely assume that for many years to come it will not be superseded.

The closing volume, like its predecessors, baffles detailed description. The random mention of a few of the larger items discussed within its nine hundred pages will serve to sharpen the appetite of the reader: *Suffering, Sunday, Summum Bonum, Symbolism, Tabu, Teleology, Theism, Theology, Time, Toleration, Totemism, Ultramontanism.*

Utilitarianism, Virgin Birth, Voltaire, War, Will, Worship, Wyclif, Zionism, Zwingli. These are some of the leading articles. Each article is signed and gives a carefully selected bibliography. And it is written in a popular form. More than two hundred specialists have contributed to the success of this great work. Together they give us a faithful picture of the growth of the human spirit and of the progress of mankind.

THEODORE F. HERMAN,